School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1353502

SUNDAY
in the Making

CHARLES HERBERT HUESTIS

J. Maxwell Chamberlin

IF SO IT PLEASE THEE FRIEND

BUT PRAY RETURN THE BOOK TO ME

WHEN YOU HAVE REACHED

THE END

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

BV
110
H84

SUNDAY IN THE MAKING

A Historical and Critical Study of the Sabbath Principle in Inheritance and Development

By

CHARLES HERBERT HUESTIS

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

Copyright, 1929, by
CHARLES HERBERT HUESTIS

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian

Printed in the United States of America

TO MY WIFE

TO WHOSE INTUITIVE INSIGHT
AND FRANK CRITICISM I OWE SO MUCH

Chamberlin, Mox

335225

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 9

PART I

THE HEBREW SABBATH

CHAPTER

I. THE TWO SONGS 15
II. THE HISTORICAL STANDPOINT 21
III. PRIMITIVE SABBATHS 26
IV. THE SABBATH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT .. 32
V. AFFILIATIONS 42
VI. TO THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY 48
VII. POST-EXILIC RELIGION AND THE SABBATH 55

PART II

THE LORD'S DAY

CHAPTER

I. THE SABBATH IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES 71
II. JESUS AND THE SABBATH 78
III. THE SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY 88
IV. THE LORD'S DAY—DEVELOPMENT 98
V. FROM THE EARLY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY TO CONSTANTINE 104
VI. THE MIDDLE AGES—AND AFTER 112

CHAPTER PAGE
VII. The Continental and English Sunday 123
VIII. Modern Times 133
IX. Reaction in Europe 140
X. Sanctions—Legal and Moral 145

PART III

THE SABBATH IDEA IN MODERN LIFE

CHAPTER
I. Introduction 159
II. The Ministry of Sunday to the Body 167
1. Protecting the Human Machine ... 167
2. The Nature and Effects of Fatigue. 172
3. Fatigue and Degeneracy 176
4. Narcotics 181
5. The Problem of Leisure 184
III. The Ministry of Sunday to the Mind 187
1. The Art of Thinking 187
2. How Sunday May Help 191
IV. The Ministry of Sunday to the Spirit 198
1. The Present Scene 198
2. The Inner Life 199
3. Wanted—Greater Souls 202
4. The Consciousness of God 205

PART IV

GUARDING THE INHERITANCE

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Democracy at the Cross Roads	211
II.	The Sabbath and Civil Law	215
III.	Democracy and Liberty	218
IV.	Making People Good by Law	225
V.	What Shall We Do With Sunday?	231
VI.	Sunday Recreation	236
VII.	Conclusion	243
	Index	253

FOREWORD

I HAVE written this book to meet a demand for which, so far as I know, there is no adequate supply, namely, a study of the Sunday question which has no particular theory to defend and which seeks to state, from the standpoint of modern biblical, archæological, and scientific knowledge, the origin of the Sabbath idea, to trace the development of the institution through the centuries, and finally to show why to-day it is in the interests of human welfare that it should be preserved.

It will be seen that this involves consideration of *fact* and of *value*. The inquiry seeks to be critical and historical: it asks about inheritance, it traces development. These are questions of fact. Then it passes from the question of fact to that of value. Whatever may have been the origin of the Sabbath idea, and however interesting the history of its development through the centuries, ought we still to retain it? May it not, like other great institutions, have had its day and now should cease to be? May it not be so involved with religious beliefs and social conditions which have been superseded that the injunction, "Remember the Sabbath day to

keep it holy," no longer deserves obedience or even attention? Saint Paul held that the Jewish Sabbath was abrogated with the coming of the Christian dispensation; he even thought its observance a mark of spiritual immaturity (Gal. 4. 10–11; Col. 2. 16–17). How are we to understand him? for in spite of his teaching the church held fast to the essential Sabbath idea. Is there something here that we cannot let go, that is of timeless value? It is the contention of the writer of this book that there is; that, in the words of one of the greatest modern psychologists, "If Sunday had no history and there were no divine sanctions, no fourth commandment, or even Bible, church, or Christianity, we should still need to observe one day in seven for reasons based upon the nature and needs of man's body and soul; and that is a vital part of race hygiene for all peoples who would attain or preserve the higher levels of civilization." [1]

It may be necessary for me to defend my use of the word "Sabbath" in the following pages. Dr. C. R. Gregory, in his charming book, *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*, takes strong exception to the common habit of calling

[1] G. Stanley Hall, *Educational Problems*, vol. ii, p. 225. Reprinted by permission of D. Appleton & Company, publishers, New York.

Sunday the Sabbath. "Sabbath is the name of Saturday," he writes. Nevertheless, I am dealing with the institution of a day of rest and worship in its wider and historical implications. "The term 'Sabbath' in ordinary usage," writes Professor Hutton Webster, "is applied to a periodical rest-day, dedicated to a god and devoted to the exercises of religion."[2] The *Concise Standard Dictionary* gives the following definition: "Sabbath. 1. The seventh day of the week, appointed in the decalogue as a day of rest, to be observed by the Jews, now Saturday. 2. The first day of the week as observed by Christians; the Lord's Day; Sunday. 3. The institution or observance of a day of rest; a time of rest, peace, or quiet." Thus, with sufficient authority, I shall make use of the term to connote the first and third parts of the above definition. The words "Lord's Day" and "Sunday" will be reserved for the Christian "Sabbath," or Sunday. I have used "Sunday" in the title because it has the widest connotation in modern English usage. Compare Longfellow: "The morning came; the dear, delicious, silent Sunday; to the weary workman, both of brain and hand, the beloved day of rest."[3]

[2] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x, p. 885. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

[3] *Kavanagh*. Reprinted by permission of Houghton Mifflin Company.

Part I

THE HEBREW SABBATH

CHAPTER I

THE TWO SONGS

We open our Bibles to be greeted by a song. If we open the New Testament, it is the Song of Angels which greets us; if we open the Old Testament, it is the Song of Creation. For the story of creation on the first page of the Bible is not prose but poetry, it is not science but religion.

In these days of critical thought and expression it is of incalculable value to perceive that poetic truth, more closely than scientific truth, is akin to religious truth. Some one has defined religion as "poetry believed." A very large part of the Old Testament, indeed its most valuable and spiritual part, is poetry. The same is true of the New Testament, though to a lesser extent. Much of the teaching of Jesus was poetic in character and even in form. We express our deepest thought in poetry. The poets, says Emerson, are liberating gods. Think of Macdonald's little poem, "Baby":

"Where did you come from, baby dear?
Out of the everywhere into the here.

"Where did you get those eyes so blue?
Out of the sky as I came through."

How a dry-as-dust scientist would jeer at such an absurdity and point out soberly that the blue eyes of our darling were not acquired from the skies, but are due on the Mendelian hypothesis to the fact that both his parents' eyes were blue! Yet what an appeal to the heart there is in those simple lines, and how true the whole poem is to what we know of ultimate reality!

> "How did they all just come to be you?
> God thought about me, and so I grew."

A very great scientist, who was also a poet, once said, "In reading the secrets of nature, I am reading the thoughts of God after Him."

And so we come back to the Song of Creation in Genesis, chapter one, and ending with verse four of chapter two. In biblical interpretation, the question will repeatedly arise whether a particular passage is to be understood as a simple narrative of facts or an idealized description; in such case the parallelism of clauses will undoubtedly be one factor of the interpretation. Let us apply this test to this first chapter of Genesis. The form of parallelism made use of in this chapter is known as the envelope figure, perhaps the most important of all forms of Hebrew poetry, by which a series of parallel lines running to any length

are inclosed between an identical (or equivalent) opening or close. Psalm 8 is a familiar example of this poetic form. The opening stanzas of Southey's poem, "Thalaba the Destroyer," are an example of the same form in English poetry. The reader is referred to Moulton's *Modern Reader's Bible*, "Genesis." He will find that the author has arranged six days of creation in groups corresponding to each other in a special relation; and then each day is furnished with an opening and closing refrain; and there was evening and there was morning one day, a second day. . . . The Song of Creation is, therefore, not a scientific treatise, but a hymn of praise to a beneficent and all-powerful Creator. It is more. If we compare it with a similar story of creation on a Babylonian tablet, we see that it is a polemic against heathenish and polytheistic ideas. The reader will find this story in *The Student's Old Testament*, Vol. I, page 362ff.

In the beginning God! That is not science but religion, though Darwin says the same thing at the close of his monumental book, *The Origin of Species*. Next in the poem is the idea of evolution; creation was a gradual process, a progressive movement of growth. The world was not made all at once; it was not constructed like a watch, it grew like a flower. To aid

human thought and to make this idea of gradual development, the writer introduces a time scale. It is a beautiful device—this use of days and nights, of evenings and mornings—to show that creation was not all at once. He adjusts the acts of the Creator to his scheme of things, for the acts were really eight and not six, as is seen in days three and six in the narrative. Of course, when the writer wrote this account of creation, the week ending with the Sabbath had attained a very great importance for religion.

On the sixth day man appears, the crown of creation—

> "Through all the compass of the notes it ran,
> The diapason closing full in Man,"

as Dryden puts it. Different from all created things he was, for a spark disturbs his clod. We read, "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him" (note the emphasis of the repetition).

Then our poet tells us how God, having created man, provides for his needs; his two great physical needs first of all, deeper and more essential than all the rest, namely, food and rest. And note how this is told, not as a scientist would tell it but as a poet, not directly but symbolically: And "the Lord . . .

rested the seventh day . . . and hallowed it." Why? Because he was weary? We might expect such a conception of God in the next chapter, where God is conceived as a child would think of him; but not in this song of Creation, where God is transcendent and omnipotent, who plans no garden nor is heard walking in one, who speaks and it is done, who commands and it stands fast. "God, the Lord, . . . fainteth not, neither is weary." As a mother performs a child's task in order that the child may learn to perform it himself, the representation of God resting on the seventh day, while no doubt intended by the writer to give additional authority to the Sabbath, symbolizes man's need of weekly rest. The truth which comes to us is this: that man's need of weekly rest is like his need of daily food; that long before it was written in a sacred book, "Six days shalt thou labor, one day shalt thou rest," this law of periodicity was written deep in the constitution of man. As F. W. Robertson writes, "I am more and more sure by practical experience that the reason for the observance of the Sabbath lies deep in the everlasting necessities of human nature, and that as long as man is man, the blessedness of keeping it, not as a day of rest only, but as a day of spiritual culture, will never be annulled."

I have brought the Song of Creation into my introduction because it seems to me that we have here the genesis of the Sabbath idea, not historically but logically and physiologically, as accepted by the prophets of Israel and by ourselves. We shall find ourselves far away from this conception of the meaning of the Sabbath as we study its inheritance and development through the centuries, only to return to it at last in the great word of Jesus: "*The Sabbath was made for man.*"

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL STANDPOINT

In discussing this question with the Hebrew and the Christian Scriptures as our chief sources of knowledge, it will be necessary to have respect for historical perspective and critical investigation.

It is important also that we recognize the progressive character of the revelation of the nature and mind of God in the Scriptures, a truth to which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews gave expression (Heb. 1. 1–2), and also the fact that the order of the books of the Bible is by no means the chronological order in which they were written.

If one is to study the Sabbath idea in the Scriptures helpfully and intelligently, one must know something of the order and literary character of the books and of the times in which they were written. He must remember especially that the Hebrew Scriptures were edited again and again in the interests of new religious and moral ideas; and most of all that the final editors, who put on the finishing touches, were priests who thought more of ritual and ceremony and institutions than they

did of plain everyday morality, which to the prophetic writers was the chief consideration.

The priestly editors, too, showed a tendency to recreate the past in the light of the present, and to find the ideas of the present day operative in bygone ages. Luther said four centuries ago that the books of Kings were "a thousand paces ahead of Chronicles and more to be believed," for his acute mind saw that the Chronicler was molding history to his heart's desire, and in the interests of the priestly class to which he belonged. Modern historical criticism has done immense service in disentangling the various threads which make up the warp and woof of the Old Testament writings and giving us a true perspective. The horrible story in the book of Numbers about the man who was stoned to death by the people, at Jehovah's command, for the crime of gathering sticks on the Sabbath, may be an invention on the part of the very late writer who held views about the Sabbath and its observance which Jesus later rebuked severely.

How Jesus Viewed the Matter

Every one who has studied the Gospels knows that the ideas held by very religious people in Jesus' day about the function and place of the Sabbath were far from right, and

that Jesus came into conflict with the leaders of his people over the matter; a conflict so serious that on one occasion, we are told, the religious and political factions of the day consulted together how they might destroy him (Mark 3. 6).

It is of particular interest that Jesus, in his discussion of the question of the observance of the Sabbath with the Pharisees, made use of what we to-day call the historical method; he appealed to the old prophetic history rather than the Pentateuchal codes as proving that the later ideas of the Sabbath were unknown in ancient time, and were developed by the priests (Matt. 12. 3ff), and to the exceptions which the scribes themselves allowed in the interests of worship (v. 5) or humanity (v. 11), as showing that the Sabbath must originally have been devoted to the welfare of humanity, and was not the purposeless and arbitrary thing which the scribes had made it to be. We shall be safe in following so distinguished a Leader.

Earliest and Latest

The earliest reference to the Sabbath in the Bible, having respect for the historical principle, is 2 Kings 4. 23, where the husband of the Shunammite woman says to her, as she is about to leave home to consult the prophet

Elisha as to the illness of her little son: "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new-moon nor Sabbath." This is an illuminating question, and may be likened to the discovery of a bit of pottery in an ancient ruin which defines the degree of culture reached by a primitive people; or a sort of Rosetta stone which gives a clue to the whole history of the development of the Sabbath idea in the Old Testament.

From this question we learn that at this early time the Sabbath was observed as a holy day, that it was associated in the minds of the people with certain Canaanitish festivals connected with the phases of the moon. It was considered a proper day on which to consult a man of God for an oracular utterance in answer to some question, and was not a day of rest in the sense of later Judaism, for there is no question of the propriety of making a journey of considerable length on that day. As Elisha's activity as a prophet occurred between 850 and 795 B.C., we have here a point from which we can get a fairly true perspective of the whole field to be covered.

The latest reference to the Sabbath in the Old Testament is in the book of Nehemiah, where we find that indefatigable patriot and statesman taking stern and effective measures

to put a stop to Sabbath trading (Neh. 13. 15–22), a picture strangely modern in character. The development of the Sabbath in the Old Testament times so far as the documents are concerned transpires between these two references.

CHAPTER III

PRIMITIVE SABBATHS

WHERE did the Sabbath idea come from? Professor Hutton Webster says, "The observance of rest days forms a fairly common custom in the lower culture, if exception be made of the Australian, Melanesian, and American areas."[1] The rest days among so-called primitive peoples are not, as a rule, periodic in character, nor are they necessarily consecrated to deity or employed in religious services. They belong, rather, he thinks, to the character of *tabu*, a widespread institution among primitive folk. "A *tabu*," he writes, "may be defined as a negative regulation or prohibition which is supported by supernatural sanctions." These Sabbaths were observed at critical times in the lives of the people or of the community, because of such events as an earthquake, a conflagration, an epidemic of sickness, after a death, at the change of the moon, at the end of the old and the beginning of the new year, and in connection with such important events as seedtime and harvest and the celebration of solemn ceremony.

[1] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x, p. 885ff.

Such Sabbaths, Webster tells us, were a noteworthy feature of Polynesian life, especially in old Hawaii, where the institution of *tabu* reached perhaps the acme of its development. These seasons were common or strict, and the observance varied. When a common season prevailed, the people were required simply to abstain from their usual occupations and to attend religious services. But the stricter observance required almost complete cessation of activity. Fires were not lighted, canoes could not be launched, no one could bathe, or even be seen out of doors, unless when required to attend the temple service, and gloom and silence prevailed all over the community. Leviticus and Numbers tell of similar observances in connection with the stated feasts and at the full moon (Lev. 23. 7f, 24–32; 16. 29–31; Num. 28. 11–15, 18, 25; 29. 1, 7). In all these instances the formula is the same, "Ye shall do no servile work." "The Greeks and the barbarians," writes Strabo, "have this in common, that they accompany their sacred rites by a festal remission of labor."

Webster states that among the Hawaiians there was a remarkable approximation to the institution of the weekly Sabbath. In every lunar month there were four *tabu* periods, dedicated severally to the four great gods of

the native pantheon. As we shall see farther on, a similar observance prevailed among the ancient Babylonians, which some authorities believe to have been the origin of the Hebrew Sabbath. The belief was that the god was pleased with the enforced idleness of his worshipers; to labor on a holy day implied a disrespectful attitude toward him. The observance of unlucky days among primitive folk is of the same character.

Webster shows that this institution prevailed all over S. E. Asia, Indonesia, Polynesia, and lends probability to the hypothesis that we are here in the presence of an institution which has been gradually diffused from its Asiatic home over the India archipelago, and thence to the islands of the Pacific. The Hindus had a similar institution with special sacrifices at the full moon. It is to be noted in these primitive Sabbaths—and the same is true of the Babylonian institution—that remission of labor was not due to any practical or humanitarian considerations, but was, like the feasts, sacrifices, and propitiations, due to a superstitious regard for the favor of the gods.

"In early society," says Westermarck, "there is little inducement to overwork, but the case is different in modern civilization. This accounts for the persistence and general popularity of an

institution which originally sprang from quite different sources, namely, Sunday rest." [1]

The Buddhists have a Sabbath, or Uposatha, which occurs four times a month, namely, on the day of the full moon, on the day of no moon, on the two days which are eighth from the full moon. On these days selling and buying, work and business, hunting and fishing, are forbidden, and all schools and law courts are closed according to Childers' *Dictionary of the Pali Language.*

Feasts Among Primitive Peoples

The religious life of most peoples of antiquity, and of primitive peoples to-day, centers around certain great festivals. This is especially true of the Semitic peoples. These feasts were originally celebrations of the fertility of nature, and were significant because they represented the united worship of family, tribe, or nation. Through them the bond was strengthened by social meeting, common feasting, merrymaking, and worship. We are not accustomed in our day to associate religion with merrymaking, but with the primitive people and with the ancient Hebrews the joyous element was very prominent. To "rejoice before the Lord" is

[1] Edward Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, vol. ii, p. 283. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

the ordinary idiom in Deuteronomy to describe a religious feast. Songs, music, dancing, drinking, and processions probably characterized all the great sacrificial feasts (Amos 2. 8, 5, 21; Judg. 21. 19ff; Isa. 28. 7, 8; 1 Sam. 1. 14). At the autum feast referred to in the passage from Judges, in the vineyard of Shiloh, the young maidens performed choral dances. "Nowhere else," writes Dr. Immanuel Benzinger, "is it more clearly seen that the keynote of the piety of early Israel was a feeling of joyful security. The ancient Israelite was contented with his God, and he knew his God was contented with him. At these feasts the covenant with Jehovah was renewed as the people brought their gifts to their divine King." [2]

Old Feasts and How They Were Changed

Three annual feasts were enjoined by the Book of the Covenant (Exod, 23. 14–17). All were occasions of rejoicing adopted from the Canaanites when the Israelites turned from a pastoral to agricultural life. The only change which seems to have been made was that now they were celebrated in honor of their common God, and no longer of the tribal deities. The feasts which had been connected with their

[2] T. K. Cheyne, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, vol. ii, col. 1512. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

pastoral life, such as the feast of sheep-shearing, fell decidedly into the background. The three annual feasts were as follows:

1. The spring festival, celebrated when the barley harvest ripened. Cakes of unleavened bread were made use of for seven days.

2. Seven weeks later, after the corn harvest, the first-fruits of the wheat were offered.

3. The autumn festival, when the grapes and other fruits were ingathered.

These primitive agricultural feasts were later made subservient to certain great events in the history of the race, in accordance with the theocratic conception of history as the story of Jehovah's guidance of his people. The first feast was called the Passover, and celebrated the deliverance from Egypt; the second commemorated the giving of the law at Sinai; and the third, the journey through the wilderness, and called the feast of tabernacles. We shall see a similar transformation as we study the development of the Sabbath.

How closely these festivals were related to the life of the people (indeed, Amos and Hosea give the impression that the entire religion of the people was contained in them) is seen in the fact that the centralization of religion at Jerusalem under the Deuteronomic economy did not at once affect their celebration.

CHAPTER IV

THE SABBATH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

We now narrow our inquiry and ask, Where did the Sabbath idea among the Hebrews come from? Was it indigenous with them, did they inherit it from their Semitic ancestors, or did they find it in Caanan when they arrived there after their adventures in the desert? This is a question upon which we shall not be able to pronounce with certainty, but the study is one of interest.

In the first chapter of Genesis, the Song of Creation made the Sabbath coeval with the creation of man, and one of the editors of the Decalogue (Exod. 20. 11) holds that opinion. But the author of the book of Deuteronomy, who gives his version of the Ten Commandments in the fifth chapter of that book, makes the Sabbath a sort of Independence Day, on which the people celebrated each week their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt and the beginning of their national life; "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by

a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." Calling to mind the time when their fathers had to work every day, they were to give their servants the day off—"that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou."

The fact that for a long period the ancient Hebrews lived a nomadic life opposes the idea of a very early observance of the Sabbath, at least as a day of rest, since the care of sheep and cattle requires the same amount of work every day. Of course there might have been, and probably was at this early period, a sacred seventh day, associated with the phases of the moon, which was observed without entire remission of labor. The word "remember" in the fourth commandment implies a previous observance of the day. Nehemiah states definitely that the Sabbath was made known at Sinai (Neh. 9. 14), no doubt voicing the tradition of his day.

More Decalogues Than One

It must be remembered that the decalogues found in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 are not the only ones in the Old Testament. There are in particular two very old decalogues, the one in Exodus 34. 14–26 and the other scattered about the 20th, 22d and 23rd chapters of that book. They represent a much older religious

cultus than the Ten Commandments, as we know them, and contain very few moral precepts, if any. One of them seems to have had its origin in the northern part of the country and the other in the south. Both of them inculcate the observance of weekly rest. In the latter we read, "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest; in plowing time and in harvest thou shalt rest" (Exod. 34. 21). In the former the words of the command are: "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass may have rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed" (Exod. 23. 12). Note the development toward a humanitarian conception of the day.

Gen. 2. 1–3 does not name the Sabbath or lay down any rule for its observance. All it says is that on the seventh day God *desisted* from his work, and that he blessed and hallowed that day. It is impossible, however, to doubt that, as noted above, the sanctity of the day antedated the time of this writing, and instead of the seventh day being sacred *because* God desisted on that day from his work of creation, the work itself is distributed by the writer through six days of activity followed by a day of rest, *because* the week ending with the Sabbath already existed as an institution of

supreme importance to religion. Driver puts it briefly: "The week ending with the Sabbath determined the 'days' of creation, not the days of creation the week."

What "Sabbath" Means

The Hebrew word "Sabbath" is capable of either of two senses. The cognate verb has both an intransitive and a transitive form. In the former it means, "desist," "cease," and in the latter, it means "to put an end to," "to divide." Thus the question arises whether the original idea of the Sabbath is the divider, the day which marks the end of one period and the beginning of the next, or the *desister*, the day which puts a stop to activity and work. The latter is clearly the meaning of the word in the Old Testament. It certainly cannot be translated "the day of rest."

But the word is used in four different ways in the Old Testament Scriptures: 1. The sacred occasion celebrated every seventh day. 2. "Week." 3. The middle of the month. 4. Designating certain sacred days, that is the fifteenth day of the seventh month (a survival, no doubt, of the festival of the full moon) and, by extension, to the eighth day because celebrated in the same manner as the first day (Lev. 23. 39). The last part of verse 39 in which

the Sabbath is applied to the two festival days in question, is said to be a later addition.

Foreshadowings From Babylon

In a lexicographical cuneiform tablet found in the ruins of Babylon there occur the words *um nuh libbi=sabattum*, or "day of rest for the heart" (a very beautiful description of the Christian Sabbath, by the way), meaning, as parallel occurrences show, a day when the gods rested from their anger, a day of pacification of the gods' wrath. This day came in the middle of the month and was probably derived from a passage in the Babylonian account of creation celebrating the full moon:

"On the seventh day the tiara perfecting,
A Sabbath shalt thou encounter midmonthly"

(In this connection it may be of interest to note that when the dates of the Israelitish feasts were definitely fixed, the days selected were full moons. The arbitrary fixing of the Sabbath at the end of six days resulted, as we shall see farther on, from a strong tendency to break away from all moon worship.)

Lucky and Unlucky Days

In a religious calendar for two Assyrian months, describing the duties of the king, the 7th, 14th, 19th (maybe 49th, that is, 7 x 7

since the beginning of the previous month), 21st and 28th days are entered as "favorable day," "evil day"; that is, a day on which almost anything might turn up—it might be lucky and it might be unlucky, according as directions for observing it were heeded or otherwise; in any event a day for watching your step. Certain acts were forbidden the king on these days. He is not, for instance, to eat food prepared by fire (compare the Mosaic requirement "ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations"), or put on royal apparel, or hold court. On the other hand, as soon as the day is over he is to offer sacrifices which will be accepted. These days were evidently regarded superstitiously; certain acts were *tabu*, lest the anger of the gods be aroused.

There is no proof, however, that the word *sabattum* was applied to these days; indeed, as we have just seen, it was the name of the day of the full moon. Nor is there any evidence at hand to show that a continuous succession of weeks each ending with a day of rest marked by special religious observances was a Babylonian institution. While there is undoubtedly a close resemblance between the Babylonian and the Hebrew cultus,[1] and while it is quite possible

[1] See on this point Jastrow's article in the *American Journal of Theology*, 1898, pp. 315-352.

that Sace and Schrader are right in holding that the weekly Sabbath was an institution of the Babylonians, yet it is significant that during the Exile in Babylonia the priestly lawgivers emphasized the Sabbath as a distinctively Israelitish institution. In fact, it was, according to Ezekiel, a sign which marked off Israel from the rest of mankind, as well as sealing the covenant between him and his God. If the Babylonians ever had the weekly Sabbath, it must have fallen into desuetude at the time of the Exile.

There is another consideration which makes the whole subject a difficult one, namely, that, except in the expansions of the fourth commandment (the original command was evidently "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy") in Exod. 20 and Deut. 5, there is nothing in preexilic literature which implicitly indicates that the word "sabbath" denoted a weekly day of rest. In the kernel of the Decalogue, Exod. 20. 8 and Deut. 5. 12, the observance of the Sabbath is enjoined, but neither the manner nor the period of its observance is prescribed. Where, on the other hand, the weekly day of rest is inculcated (Exod. 23. 12; 34. 21), the name "sabbath" does not occur.

But turning from these critical questions, it seems probable, at least to the present writer,

that the Hebrews got the idea from the agricultural people of Canaan and that ultimately it is to be traced back, as the Babylonian institution mentioned above, to the remote ancestors of the Semitic race (to which race the Canaanites belonged) who paid homage to the moon, whose benign light guided them in their journeys across the northern plains of Arabia. Originally, like the feast of the new moon, it was doubtless observed as a festival or holiday, and as a natural consequence there would come remission from labor, as with every ancient festival. "Generally speaking, the nomadic elements are original constituents of the religion of Israel," writes G. F. Moore, "and the agricultural rites are grafted upon it." [1]

In early times the thought of religion as something irksome or binding was quite foreign to the national consciousness. The Sabbath was a day of recreation, irksome only to the greedy and the selfish, as Amos and Hosea tell us (Amos 8. 5; Hos. 2. 11). In this way the day differed from the Assyrian "sabbaths" which were not joyous but unlucky days, and were especially designated as such. The old Semitic word *ahalla*, which means "to greet the new moon," is etymologically connected, as

[1] *History of Religions*, vol. ii, p. 5. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

Lagarde has shown, with the Hebrew word used for any festal joy. It is important to note this distinction.

Moreover, the Hebrew Sabbath is an expression of religious ideas and a conception of divine government utterly different from those found in the religions of Babylonia and Assyria. Indeed, we look in vain among the religions of antiquity for such a day of rest and spiritual recreation. The Babylonian *sabattum* stands in direct relation to the significance attached to the phases of the moon in astrology. It is true we can trace a like association in the Bible. Read 2 Kings 4. 23; Isa. 1. 13; Amos 8. 5, Isa. 66. 23, Hos. 2. 11. "How far, how infinitely far," writes Morris Jastrow, "from the Babylonian *sabattum* or from the lucky and unlucky days of the month which play so important a rôle in all the religions of antiquity, [is the Sabbath of the Old Testament!] It rises," he says, "superior to the festivals which mark the transitional periods in nature and which Judaism preserved, and stands above the level of the rites and customs set aside for transitional periods in nature and which Judaism preserved, and stands above the level of the rites and customs set aside for transitional epochs of human life." "In this transition," writes Jastrow again, "in meaning from the use of a term designating

the middle of the month to the designation of a week of seven days, lies the whole history of the Hebrew institution." [1]

The attempt to show that not only the Babylonian *sabattum*, but also the Hebrew Sabbath was a feast of the full moon is little more than an ingenious paradox. The way the Sabbath is isolated in the Old Testament from other sacred seasons (2 Kings 11. 5ff.; 16, 18) goes to show that even in pre-exilic times it was a festival by itself, and had already acquired something of the prominence which it enjoyed in later times. The most reasonable theory is that the Sabbath is generally presupposed in the Old Testament, and that it is only historically connected with something of like nature in the Babylonian cultus. The development lies behind the range of Israelite tradition, and the institution was probably a feature of Canaanite civilization when the Hebrews settled in that country. Further than this we cannot go, with our present knowledge of the subject.

[1] *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions*, pp. 173-74, 186. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

CHAPTER V

AFFILIATIONS

ALTHOUGH not recognized by pre-exilic lawgivers, the feast of the *new moon* appears to have had originally an equal and perhaps even greater prominence than the Sabbath. 2 Kings 4. 23 indicates that on new moons as well as on Sabbaths people went to seers for counsel. An extra sacrifice was also customary on the new moon (1 Sam. 20. 5, 6; 1 Chron. 23. 31). In Isa. 1. 14 new moons are classified with appointed feasts as being abhorrent to Jehovah. All were occasions for rejoicing (Hos. 2. 11). From 1 Sam. 20. 5–27, it would seem that the new moon was pre-eminently a feast of clan gatherings, and its importance is seen in the fact that it was not permissible for anyone to absent himself without adequate reason. This would tend to keep alive the ethnic traditions and usages and to emphasize religious decentralization. Perhaps this is the reason this institution is so completely ignored in existing pre-exilic codes and is given only passing notice in priestly ones. In spite of this the feasts seem to have continued till Ezekiel's time, for he provides for worship on the new moon, in the

Messianic Age as well as on the Sabbath (Ezek. 46. 1ff.).

The institution ceased in time to be a clan or family festival, and with the centralization of all worship in Jerusalem it became simply a ceremonial function. But it still occupied a place in the hearts of the people at a late date (Isa. 66. 23). This shows how difficult it is for reformers to eradicate age-long traditions and customs from the hearts and minds of the people. At Ur and Haran, where the Hebrew traditions trace the origin of the primitive ancestors of the Israelites, Sin, the moon-god, was the principal deity. Even Sinai bears the name of this god. Job refers to the worship of the moon (31. 26–27) and so do Ezekiel (8. 14) and Isaiah (3. 18). "There can be little doubt," writes Westermarck, "that the Jewish Sabbath originated in the belief that it was inauspicious and dangerous to work on the seventh day, and that the reason for this belief was the mystic connection which, in the opinion of the ancient Hebrews, as of so many other peoples, existed between human activity and the changes of the moon."[1] Under the prophets the Sabbath idea was detached from its connections with the phases of the moon, and fixed for every seventh day. They extended and generalized the absti-

[1] *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, vol. ii, p. 287.

nence associated with the heathen festivals, stripped it of its superstitious associations, and made it subservient to ethical and religious ideas.

The Prophets Wise Schoolmasters

In any study of the Old Testament the method of the writers in making use of the pedagogical principle of building on foundations already laid is apparent. As is well known, the early stories of Genesis are based upon traditions which were well known to people. The prophetic writers took these stories, divested them of their heathen religious conceptions, and made them subservient to high moral teachings. So the spiritual leaders of Israel did not attempt to introduce a new institution, but took over the custom of the people of Canaan, and poured into it a new moral and spiritual content. Much of the early cultus of Israel was borrowed from other sources. But borrowing in civilization does not always prove a debt. It may prove a curse to the borrower, and, moreover, the civilization improves its quality not only by what it borrows from other civilizations but by what it refuses to borrow. The greatness of European music is shown from the fact that it copied from no kindred original, and the greatness of the Hebrew Sabbath is revealed in the same way.

All that it copied was periodical observance. To borrow is to help oneself, but the thing borrowed must be kept alive, and assimilated to the national cultus.

As has been beautifully said, "God begins where the people are." Christianity adopted the ancient festivals as the basis of our Christmas and Easter celebrations. Our ancient ancestors celebrated the Yule-tide festival in much the same way as we do Christmas. Living as they did in a northern land, the victory of the sun over the powers of ice and cold was a time of greatest rejoicing. In Britain the 25th of December was a festival long before its concession to Christianity, and Bede related that "the ancient peoples of the Angli began the year on the 25th of December when we now celebrate the birthday of our Lord."

The name "Easter" is derived from *Eostre*, the Anglo-Saxon goddess of spring, to whom the month answering to our April was dedicated. Nearly all the popular customs connected with this feast, such as the sending of eggs as presents, are of heathen origin.

Summing Up

In the development of the Sabbath idea we have seen that there are traces of lucky and unlucky days, of a significance attached to

periods of transition, of the special importance of the number seven, due to astrological influences, of precautions exercised on certain days, indications of which we still find in some of the priestly codes. But, starting from the common ground of all primitive religions, the Hebrews developed an entirely different institution which retained little more than the name of the Babylonian counterpart. The Sabbath as a distinctively Hebrew rite starts out as a humanitarian institution with a view to securing for the people recreation and relief from daily labors and of offering to those dependent upon them opportunity to "refresh themselves." Thus the Sabbath observed every seven days without regard to the phases of the moon becomes a unique institution. The idea of resting becomes a significant expression of the ethical view of life and its relation to the divine economy as implied in the utterances of the Hebrew prophets. The material conception of labor was given a spiritual interpretation through the sanctification of labor on the one hand, and, on the other, the recognition of the obligations of those who employ labor—that "thy manservant, and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou." Equality of opportunity was thus afforded to the community of Israel, and the stranger with them enjoyed the

same privilege: even the beasts of burden should share in the weekly rest. In spite of the strict regulations following the Exile, these conceptions were never lost sight of, and they persist down to the present day in the midst of a civilization of which Moses could never have dreamed.

In ancient times the Sabbath was the least of the holy days. As one of the distinctive observances which was not dependent on the temple or the priestly liturgy, but could be kept anywhere, it gained increased importance during and after the Exile. Of this later development we have so far had only occasional glimpses.

CHAPTER VI

To the Law and Testimony

In pushing this study further, it will be both helpful and interesting to put down all the principal passages in the Old Testament in which the Sabbath or seventh day is mentioned, so far as possible in the chronological order in which they were written. This cannot, of course, be done with precision, but we know that there is a great Divide, to wit, the Exile; and that the Sabbath after the Exile was a very different institution from what it was before that great experience in the history of Israel. In no way can we better get a sense of this difference than by reading the passages themselves.

Before the Exile we have:

2 Kings 4. 23: "And he said, Wherefore wilt thou go to him [the prophet Elisha] to-day? It is neither new moon nor sabbath."

Amos 8. 5 (the merchants are speaking): "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" See also Hos. 2. 11.

Isa. 1. 14: "Your new moons and your

appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them." Exod. 34. 21. "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest; in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest." Exod. 23. 12. "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass may have rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed." (Note that in these two passages the name Sabbath is not mentioned.)

Exod. 20. 8–11 and Deut. 5. 12–15. It will not be necessary to quote these familiar words of the Ten Commandments. But it is needful to remember that their original form has been expanded by later writers who give different reasons for its observance, as we have already noted.

Jer. 17. 19–27. The passage is too long to quote but should be read. It forbids the "bearing of burdens" on the Sabbath and "any work." Whether this passage from Jeremiah is by his hand or a later addition is a matter of doubt. Driver, who is a competent authority, ascribes it to the prophet himself. If Driver is right, the Sabbath in Jeremiah's time was a religious institution, the observance or nonobservance of which might be taken as a test of one's loyalty to Jehovah. It thus forms

an introduction to the conception of the Sabbath after the Exile.

After the Exile we have:

Holiness Code

Lev. 19. 3b: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths: I am the Lord your God."

Exod. 31. 12–13: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Verily ye shall keep my sabbaths; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord which sanctify you." Verse 14: "Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that profaneth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people."

Priestly Codes

Exod. 35. 1–3: "Moses assembled all the congregation of the children of Israel, and said unto them, These are the words which the Lord hath commanded, that ye should do them. Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of solemn rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day."

Gen. 2. 2–3: "And on the seventh day God had finished his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; because that in it he rested from all his work which God had created and made."

Supplemental Priestly Codes

Exod. 31. 15–17. "Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day is a sabbath of solemn rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Therefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign, between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."

Lev. 23. 3: "Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day is a sabbath of solemn rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no manner of work: it is a sabbath unto the Lord in all your dwellings."

Exod. 16. 22–26: "On the sixth day they [in the wilderness] gathered twice as much bread, two omers for each one: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And

he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath spoken, To-morrow is a solemn rest, a holy sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake, and seethe that which ye will seethe; and all that remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning and they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day is the sabbath, in it shall there be none."

Num. 15. 32–36: "While the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man gathering sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it had not been declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." Num. 28. 9, 10: "And on the sabbath day two helambs of the first year without blemish, and two tenth parts of an ephah of fine flour for

meal offering, mingled with oil, and the drink offering thereof; this is the burnt offering of every sabbath."

Ezek. 20. 12, 20; 44. 24; 20. 13–24; 22. 8, 26; 23. 38; 45. 17; 46. 1–5, 12; and Isa. 56. 4–7; 58. 13, 14; 66. 23. These passages are too long to quote, but they should be read. They include all the references to the Sabbath in Ezekiel and those of post-exilic writers whose prophecies are included in the book of Isaiah in the Bible.

The Great Divide

In comparing these two sections of the Scriptures of the Old Testament certain marked differences in the conception of the Sabbath are to be noted. In the earlier passages, on the other side of the Divide, where we come in touch with the real life of the people, all that is demanded on the Sabbath is cessation from daily toil, especially from agricultural labor; and emphasis is placed upon the humanitarian side of the institution as a holiday for the working classes (Exod. 23. 12; Deut. 5. 13–15). In the decalogues, as we have seen, the original prohibition has been expanded in the interest of later religious ideas. In earliest days the Sabbath seems to have been, like similar institutions of primitive peoples, a holiday rather than a holy-day in the modern sense of the

term. The passages from Kings and Hosea imply that the Sabbath, though it had a religious object, was also the occasion of social relaxation. According to Amos, trade and commerce ceased on the Sabbath, as well as work in the fields. He tells of the lamentations of business men because the Sabbath had come in and interrupted their money-making. Isaiah seems to imply that certain sacrifices were connected with the Sabbath, and Hosea seems to take it for granted that in the coming Exile it will not be possible to observe the Sabbath because there will be no sanctuary there (2. 11). Isaiah speaks somewhat contemptuously of Sabbath observance as something Jehovah cared little for—a mere formality (1. 13, 14).

In Deuteronomy there is a development from the earlier conception. The many sacred places were to be abandoned and the religion of the people centered in Jerusalem. Hence all the old feasts, in theory, had to go. But the Sabbath remained, no longer a mere religious ceremony, but a humane institution, pure and simple.

CHAPTER VII

POST-EXILIC RELIGION AND THE SABBATH

RELIGION was a very different thing after the Exile from what it was before that great national experience. According to the priestly economy *all* the time of the people belonged to Jehovah, and is to be given back to him by the dedication of specially holy seasons. Resting on the number seven, and going back to the original conception and the theory of creation, the cycle of festivals embraces every important occasion in the people's life, whether natural or historical, which indicates spiritual relationship with God. This cycle of festivals is founded upon the hallowing of the seventh day. We have seen how this day of rest was mentioned in the fundamental laws of the people, and how the writer of Deuteronomy bases it upon the grateful kindness of a redeemed people to the oppressed and toiling classes of society. But with the priestly writers the essential character of the day is *perfect rest.* Sabbath labor is strictly forbidden, because the day belongs to God, and to withhold any part of it from

him, by using it for the ordinary duties of life, is impious sacrilege and may be punished by death.

This is all part and parcel with the character of the post-exilic religion. The old joyous fellowship with Jehovah was overwhelmed by an increasing sense of sin under the dark shadow of the Exile. Israel became a company of individuals in a sacred community. Every act of life must be holy. The religious feeling was deeper than ever and more universal. In the interests of religion the people "took upon themselves the severest yoke ever placed by religion upon the neck of man." Sacrifice is now the supreme religious act, and is no more accompanied by gladness and joyous participation in the fellowship with Jehovah; it represents purification from sin, not fellowship with God, and it is the chief symbol and great mystery of their faith.

But holiness is not necessarily ethical. To be holy a man must wash, must not eat any unclean thing, must observe the Sabbath.

"Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord?
or who shall stand in his holy place?
He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart"

—so sang one of Israel's psalmists. But now a man who would ascend unto the hill of Jehovah must be "one who has not eaten shell-fish or pork, nor opened his shop on the Sabbath, nor

touched a dead body, nor used a spoon handed him by a Gentile without first washing it."

Under the influence of this situation the Sabbath, as is seen in the above passages on this side of the Great Divide, lost its original philanthropic character, and became a ceremonial institution accompanied by *tabu*. In faithfully observing the Sabbath, however, the exiles felt that in a foreign land they were giving silent testimony to their faith and showing loyalty to their divine King. But the more it took the place of the ancient feasts and sacrifices, the more the people forgot that the Sabbath was God's good gift to his toiling children and it gradually became the arbitrary thing which Jesus found.

Of course this is to be regretted, as is much else in Judaism; but it is to be remembered that it was this very strictness of observance which preserved for early Christianity the precious Sabbath idea, just as a similar strictness on the part of our fathers preserved the Lord's Day for us. All that was needed was the emancipating word of Jesus to separate it from its cocoon and give it a glorious resurrection. It is probable also that from the Exile dates the custom, which still exists with us, of assembling on the Sabbath for the reading and study of the Scriptures; which gave birth to

the later synagogue and still later Christian service.

An Ancient Story

Cheyne, in his book, *Jewish Religious Life After the Exile*, gives a graphic, if somewhat satirical, picture of a zeal for Sabbath observance born of the new regime after the Exile, in his account of the efforts of Nehemiah to deal with the matter of Sabbath-breaking. Nehemiah was a partisan of the code which made Sabbath-breaking punishable by death, a law which had evidently, fallen into desuetude. As governor of Jerusalem he assumed also the functions of chief constable. "He would trust no information," writes Cheyne, "but on his first arrival in Jerusalem went out to gather facts for himself. It was the Sabbath Day, and the villagers were enlivened with the merry shouts of those who trod the wine-press, innocently supposing that this pleasant task was no violation of the Sabbath law. Then he looked elsewhere and saw villagers leading their asses with grain, fruit and wine, so as to arrive in Jerusalem on the next market day. Nehemiah kept his counsel, but when market day arrived he warned the sellers not to start from home on the Sabbath day again.

"The Sabbath trade in fish also excited his indignation, though he found not so much

fault with the Syrians who sold as with the Jews who bought the fish. (It was salted and dried fish from the Mediterranean.) Nehemiah administered a severe rebuke to the principal Jews, reminding them that Sabbath-breaking had brought ruin in the past, and that more troubles would be the consequence of such profane conduct. He gave orders that the city gates should be shut and that no one bringing in merchandise should be admitted.

"The traders saw nothing for it but to pass the twenty-four hours without the walls. Even this irritated the governor. The Jews who went out into the country on the Sabbath might be induced to attempt an infraction of the law, so Nehemiah threatened the traders that unless they desisted altogether, he would drive them from the neighborhood by force.

"It is a scene from real life that we have before us," concludes Cheyne, "and it helps us to understand the transition from the gentle code of Deuteronomy to the consistently severe code of Ezra." [1]

The incident had consequences for ages to come, for the harsh requirements of Puritanism, to which I shall refer, found authority in such a record as this. But this is not the whole

[1] Reprinted by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons, publishers, New York.

story, nor does it display the other phases of Sabbath observance. There is another passage in the book of Nehemiah (chapter 8) in which the writer tells of the reading of the law to the assembled people by Ezra, the priest. We read: (verse 8) "So they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly; and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. And Nehemiah, which is the Tirshatha, and Ezra, the priest the scribe, and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people, This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep. . . . Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto him for whom nothing is prepared; for this day is holy unto our Lord: neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength." There is strong probability that this occasion was on the Sabbath.

Says Doctor Abrahams, of Cambridge: "The idea that the Sabbath was felt as a burden (in later times) has no foundation whatever. Once and for all, this misconception was dispelled by S. Schlechter in his studies in Judaism. The Sabbath was given in love; it was a good gift; it was a day of happiness and delight."[2]

---

[2] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x, p. 892. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

A midrash for Psa. 92 reads: "Sanctify or honor the Sabbath by choice meals, beautiful garments; delight your soul with pleasure and I will reward you" (for this very pleasure). Heine's poem on the "Princess Sabbath" conveys some of the charm which pervaded the Sabbath as the result of an idealization which became the source of a large number of remarkably beautiful home rites.

The Sabbath and National Greatness

There is a passage from a late writer who belongs to this side of the Great Divide, who condemns in no sparing terms the religious formalism of the day, who made use of the language of eloquence in his praise of the Sabbath, and indicated his belief that the welfare and prosperity of the people were wrapped up with its observance. Nowhere in the Bible is the Sabbath as a national asset so strongly expressed as in the familiar words: "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, and the holy of the Lord honorable; and shall honor it, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; [that is, lip service]; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will make thee [he is ad-

dressing the nation] to ride upon the high places of the earth; and I will feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Though this passage belongs to the second sections of passages given above, many of which are of a very different spirit, the Sabbath the writer celebrates is both holy and humane; a day set aside for the higher spiritual purposes and marked by an interruption of the ordinary pursuits of the week; a day not of restrictions but of recreation in which one is to refresh himself, which should fill him with delight, bringing rest to his body and peace to his spirit.

The Divine Authority

Writes Kent: "Two great truths underlie the authority of Israel's laws. The first truth is: back of the laws lie the work and teachings of the great prophets of Israel, who proclaimed the great principles which the laws embody. The second truth is: back of the prophets, and speaking through them and the conscience of the Israelitish race, was Israel's God. The various processes and stages whereby the different laws attained their final form may be traced in detail [as we have tried to trace that of the Sabbath]; but they are of minor importance with the supreme fact that Israel's

laws contain God's directions adapted at each point to the intelligence and needs of the race."[1]

This part of our study may be closed by tracing the development of the Sabbath idea in the five great periods of the history of Israel:

1. *Nomadic Period.* The Sabbath as a rest day could not have been observed, though some similar day connected with the phases of the moon no doubt existed, associated with *tabus.*

2. *Canaanite Period.* This is from the settlement in the land to the revolution under Jehu in 842 B. C. It is probable, as we have seen, that the Sabbath was adopted as a day of rest at this time in accordance with the customs of the country. This does not, of course, deny the Babylonian origin of the institution, for the Canaanites were Babylonian colonists and kinsmen of the Israelites.

3. *Prophetic Period.* Dating from 842 to 588 B. C. Though the prophets Amos and Isaiah did not think much of the Sabbath, it was through the prophetic agency of this period that the day was gradually divested of its pagan elements and made to stand for the

[1] C. F. Kent, *The Students' Old Testament,* vol. iv, p. 11. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

welfare of man. Deut. 5. 12 sums up this aspect of the case.

4. *Exilic and Post-Exilic Period.* Here the Sabbath got its binding and ultra-sacred character. This was natural, for they were far from the Temple and its service, and the Sabbath was the one great institution of their religion they could still observe.

5. *The Oral Law and Between the Testaments.* The canon was closed and nothing could be added; but the scribes were able to make additions and interpretations in accordance with their conception of religion.

Day of Rest and Gladness

In all these periods of development two ideas persist. The first is the idea of Rest. Though various reasons for the observance of the day are given, the idea of rest persists through all. In the primitive decalogues it is that all may rest, and especially that servants and beasts of burden may be refreshed. In Deuteronomy the day is observed as a memorial of the deliverance from the bond-service of Egypt and the founding of the national life. In a later writer the Sabbath is to be observed because God rested from his work of creation on the seventh day and thus set an example for his children. Later still, it is to be observed as

holy unto Jehovah and as a sign between Jehovah and his people. But the thought of rest is never absent.

The other idea is that of Joy. It is important that we should not overlook this aspect of the question. We have seen how in early times the Sabbath was a holiday for the working classes and there is no doubt that it was celebrated as other festivals with many manifestations of gladness. We have also seen that even the shadow of the Exile did not quite suppress this aspect of the early Sabbath. Seneca thought the day simply one of idleness: "To remain idle every seventh day is to lose a seventh part of life, while many pressing interests suffer by this idleness," he writes. He seems to have been quite ignorant of how the pious Jew filled the leisure the day offered him. Science subsequently stamped with its approval this positive aspect of the observance of the day. One of the hymns sung by pious Jews on Friday evening throws a clear light upon the Jewish feeling regarding the Sabbath:

"This day is for Israel light and rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.
Thou badest us standing assembled at Sinai
That all the years through we should keep thy behest—
To set out a table full laden, to honor

The Sabbath of rest.
This day is for Israel light and rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.

"Treasure of heart for the broken people,
Gift of new soul for the souls distressed,
Soother of signs for the prisoned spirit—
This day is for Israel light and rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.

"When the work of the worlds in their wonder was finished,
Thou madest this day to be holy and blest,
And those heavy laden found safety and stillness,
A Sabbath of rest.
This day is for Israel a day of rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.

"If I keep thy command, I inherit a kingdom,
If I treasure the Sabbath I bring thee the best—
The noblest of offerings the sweetest of incense—
A Sabbath of rest,
This day is for Israel light and rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest.

"Before us our shrine—O remember our ruin
And save now and comfort the sorely oppressed,
Now sitting at Sabbath, all, singing and praising
The Sabbath of rest.
This day is for Israel a day of rejoicing,
A Sabbath of rest."

(Translated by Mrs. R. N. Salaman.)

"The most remarkable phrase in this hymn," writes Doctor Abrahams, of Cambridge, to whom I am indebted for the quotation, "is contained in the second verse, which introduces, with lyric pathos, the idea of the over-soul, which resides in man during the Sabbath. The hymn is probably of the thirteenth century." [1]

[1] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x, p. 892.

PART II
THE LORD'S DAY

CHAPTER I

THE SABBATH IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

During the Exile and after, as we have seen, the character of the Sabbath changed from a humane institution, a holiday for the working classes and a glad memorial of the goodness of Jehovah in the history of Israel (Deut. 5. 12), to an arbitrary sign between Jehovah and his people and a ceremonial institution associated with *tabus*, with little religious or moral value. It quickly lost its former pleasing character when it was enforced by the civil arm and its violation made a criminal offense.

The character of the Sabbath in New Testament times is marked by the gradual neglect of its observance in the early Christian community, and the substitution in the Christian Church of the Lord's Day into which was poured much of the content of the earlier institution. This happened, not, as has been asserted, to spite the Jews, but because of the attitude of Jesus to the Sabbath of the scribes. This was in accordance with his thought of the law as not an end in itself, but as a help toward a

realization in life of his ideal of love to God and man, which is the sum of all true religion.

Between the Testaments

The Old Testament writings bring the record to the second century before Christ; and the rich and voluminous volume of literature included in the Apocrypha testifies to the truth that "God was not dumb that he should speak no more." Hence there was no "period of silence," for there was produced between 180 B. C. and 100 A. D. an abundant literature written chiefly under assumed names of ancient worthies of Israel. Many of the ideas which Jesus found in the minds of his contemporaries, and which formed the foundation upon which he based his own teachings, are to be found in these books. The chief element of this literature is apocalyptic, a sort of prophetic writing; and *apocalyptic*, as distinguished from *legalistic*. Judaism was, historically speaking, the forerunner of Christianity. Legalistic Judaism found expression in the Talmud, the book of civil and ceremonial law not found in the Old Testament, which represents the lineal development of Old Testament religion in its later expression. The place of the Sabbath in the New Testament is better appreciated if a preliminary study of the regulations regarding the

Sabbath in the Mishna, or first part of the Tamud is made, for there can be traced the development of the idea between the Testaments.

Two treatises in the Mishna, *Shabbath* and *Erubin*, deal expressly with Sabbath observance, as well as parts of others. *Shabbath* is concerned with regulations respecting what is lawful and unlawful on that day, and *Erubin* treats of modifications of laws concerning travel or the moving of anything from one place to another on the Sabbath.

In accordance with the Jewish custom, having its origin in the refrain of the Song of Creation, "and the evening and the morning were one day," the Sabbath was considered to begin at sunset on Friday and to end at sunset on Saturday. The day preceding the Sabbath, or, indeed, any feast, was called the Preparation (Luke 23. 54; John 19. 31–42), on which all work must be finished and nothing new attempted unless there was time to finish it before sunset. For instance, a tailor must not go out carrying his needle near dusk on Friday, lest through thoughtlessness he should carry it on the Sabbath; and food must not be cooked unless it could be quite done before the sun sets on Friday evening.

This explains the request of the Jews to

Pilate that the bodies of Jesus and the malefactors should be taken down (John 19. 31). It was the custom of the Jews, so Josephus tells us, to take down the bodies of those who had been crucified and bury them before sunset. It also explains the haste in the entombment of the Master's body. He died at the third hour and Joseph and his friends had to finish the temporary burial and return to their homes before sunset, leaving until the Sabbath was over the completion of the embalming (Luke 23. 56). They could prepare the spices after sunset on Saturday and be ready to go to the tomb early Sunday morning (Luke 24. 1).

Just before sunset the Sabbath lamp was lighted, a symbolical introduction to the day which must not be neglected. As no fire could be lighted in their dwellings on the Sabbath, all meals had to be prepared on Friday. Three meals were customary on the Sabbath, one after sunset Friday, another the following morning, called *ariston*, and the third called *deipnon*, toward evening (John 12. 2). In order to preserve the festal character of the day, the provisions were of the best obtainable and the best (compare our "Sunday") clothes were worn. Religious services were held in the synagogue. These were generally two in number, one on Friday night and the other the next morning.

Morals in the Making

The traditional rules of the Mishna which existed, at least in part, in Jesus' day, introduced very embarrassing limitations into action lawful on the Sabbath. The distance, for instance, that one might travel was limited to two thousand cubits, or about one thousand yards. This rule was obtained as follows: according to Exod. 16. 29, no man may "go out of his place" on the Sabbath. The exact extent of a man's "place" was fixed by the rabbis as the distance of the tabernacle from the camp of Israel in the wilderness. This was somewhat arbitrarily set down as the same distance by which the ark of the covenant preceded the people at the crossing of the Jordan (Josh. 3. 4). In this absurd way arose the measurement known as a "sabbath day's journey" (Acts 1. 12). There were a number of clever artifices, however, by which a journey could be lengthened out. These were invented by the scribes, who were past masters in casuistry, into which we have no need to go; but it is clear that the Sabbath regulations were of an artificial character and very far from the conceptions of the prophets as to the function of the day.

The Mishna enumerates 39 different kinds of work which are *tabu* on the Sabbath, and

from these deduces 1,521 which it pronounces likewise unlawful; and then it proceeds by casuistry to define what kind of actions are permissible. Why just 39? we may ask. This was the reason given by the scribes. Moses had said, "These are the words." Now, the arithmetical sum of the Hebrew letters comprising the word "these" is 33, and the value of "the words" was calculated to be 6. 33 plus 6 equals 39. That settled it. The number of additional prescriptions, namely, 1,521, was quickly arrived at by the simple process of multiplying 39 by 39. One is reminded of the methods used in our day by some uncritical sects, in extracting prophecies out of the measurements of the great pyramid.

Here are afew examples of scribal ingenuity, taken at random. It is not sufficient merely to forbid the tying or untying of knots on the Sabbath; the kind of knot must be specified. It was forbidden to tie or untie a camel knot, or a boatman's knot; but it was permitted to tie or untie a knot which required only one hand for the operation. Thus a man could untie his beast and lead it to water. A woman might tie on various articles of dress; or she might tie up a skin of oil or wine or a pot of meat. It was permissible to tie a pail to a well by a leathern band, but not by a rope. So in the

matter of cures, the general principle was that only when life was in danger could sick persons be treated on the Sabbath. Long lists of ailments are mentioned which might or might not be treated, but the distinctions drawn seem absurd and arbitrary. For instance; "He who has a toothache must nor rinse his teeth with vinegar (and spit it out again, for this would be to apply a medicine); but he may wash them as usual (and swallow the vinegar, for this would be merely taking food)." The rabbis said that God had created the human race that he might have someone to keep the Sabbath.

CHAPTER II

JESUS AND THE SABBATH

In the eyes of the Pharisees Jesus was a Sabbath-breaker and the Gospels mark the growing animosity of these defenders of religion against the Master in this matter. Holding the Sabbath to be the very heart of their religion, the Pharisees could not look with complacency upon his apparent disregard of the institution. They had either to take issue with Jesus or stultify themselves in the eyes of the people.

At the time the Gospels were written the question was evidently one of great importance as reflected in their pages. It will be interesting and informing to study these instances, so far as possible, in the chronological order of their occurrence.

1. The preaching of the kingdom of God in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke 4. 16–30; Mark, 6. 1–6). Here we see Jesus, in accordance with the custom of his people, worshiping on the Sabbath.

2. The healing of the man with the unclean spirit at Capernaum (Mark 1. 21–27; Luke 4. 33–37). This caused astonishment, but so

far as the record goes, there is no comment on Sabbath healing. The same is true of—

3. The healing of Peter's mother-in-law on the same day (Mark 1. 29–32; Matt. 8. 14, 15; Luke 4. 35–40). But these events occurred in Galilee, where the observance of religion was not so strict as in the southern parts; or the defenders of the faith did not have so much influence. The storm of protest began with the next instance:

4. Healing of the infirm man at the Pool of Bethesda (John 5. 5–18). When the poor fellow told the Jews that it was Jesus who had made him whole and told him to carry his mat on the Sabbath, we read: "For this cause did the Jews persecute Jesus because he did these things on the sabbath." This event happened in Jerusalem and near the Temple, hence the explosion of wrath on the part of the Pharisees. In the course of the discussion which followed, Jesus introduced a point over which the rabbis had puzzled in vain, when he said, "My Father worketh even until now, and I work." Why does God not keep the Sabbath? was a question which had been asked and to which there seemed to be no adequate answer; they could not think of an idle God, as some of their intellectual descendants do to-day. They decided it was better not to follow up this difficult trail, but

"sought the more to kill him, because he not only brake the sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God," John tells us.

5. Plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath, a thing which was permitted on other days (Deut. 23. 25). The act seems so trivial that one wonders why exception was taken, but upon the matter the Talmud is very clear. Plucking the ears was harvesting, and rubbing them in their hands was threshing. Here Jesus appeals in a sort of *argumentum ad hominum* to the example of their own King David, whose life and character had become idealized in the course of the centuries. Because he was hungry, says Jesus, in effect, David and his companions broke an old ceremonial law; my disciples have done no differently. He then lays down the fundamental principle of the Sabbath—that it was made for man. The same principle is illustrated even more clearly in the next instance:

6. The healing of the man with the withered hand (Mark 3. 1–5; Matt. 12. 9–14; Luke 6. 6–11). Jesus is in a synagogue of Galilee at the time, but the Pharisees are on the watch to see whether he would heal on the Sabbath day, "that they might accuse him." Here we have the whole story in a nutshell. The

Pharisees have come to look for these Sabbath healings, spies they are who are anxious to make out a case against Jesus which will stand. Matthew tells how they finally made a formal challenge to Jesus by asking, flatly, "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?" This was a crisis in the life of the Master, and he deliberately faced the challenge. In this and the preceding instance Jesus applies his principle of love to this the most important of Jewish religious institutions, and brings out his conviction that every institution, no matter how sacred, is to be regarded as simply a means to an end, which end is the welfare of man; and that love is the fulfilling of the law. "Is it lawful," he asks, "to do good on the sabbath day or to do harm; to save life or to kill?" There could be only one answer to that question, and needless to say the Pharisees did not attempt to give it, but "took counsel with the Herodians how they might destroy him." This is an effective way of dealing with ideas which are not liked by state or church: kill the person who holds them.

7. Opening the eyes of the blind man at the Pool of Siloam (John 9. 11–38). Here both making clay and healing a man not in immediate danger of death were breaches of the Sabbath law as interpreted by the scribes. The narra-

tive is full of humor, and we cannot help smiling—as no doubt Jesus smiled—at the Pharisees entangled in their own theological net, out of which predicament the blind man stoutly refuses to disentangle them. If Jesus were of God, they argue, he wouldn't break God's laws and heal on the Sabbath; on the other hand, how could he perform such miracles if he did not possess divine power? Finally they agreed to admit that he had healed the blind man if he will agree that Jesus is a sinner, because doing what belongs to God must make him so. The blind man has a good deal of fun over the dilemma of the Jews, who at last turn on him with rage—"Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? And they cast him out."

8. The hunchbacked old woman "with a spirit of infirmity" (Luke 13. 11–17). The ruler of the synagogue flies into a rage at such unholy deeds committed in a house of worship. Jesus' rebuke of the ruler of the synagogue is withering in its irony, and John remarks at the end of his relation of the incident, "And as he said these things, all his adversaries were put to shame; and all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him."

9. The man with the dropsy (Luke 14. 1–6). This was probably in Perea. He was at break-

fast with a Pharisee, and "they were watching him," though one of them was his host. Jesus proved himself master of the occasion. He not only healed the man but he carried the warfare to the gates of his enemies by asking them embarrassing questions about the use of the Sabbath, and told some stories to illustrate the attitude of courtesy due on the part of a host to his guests.

10 and 11. The supper at Bethany, which was the usual festive meal, or *deipnon;* and the Sabbath between the crucifixion and the resurrection. The controversy had ceased; the tragedy had begun—and ended.

A study of the above incidents reveals very clearly the attitude and teaching of Jesus with regard to this ancient institution of his people. When we are disposed to press upon other people our own ideas as to how the Lord's Day should be observed, we should remember that in the eyes of the religious people of his day Jesus didn't observe the Sabbath very well.

The Mind of the Master

In a word, the teaching of Jesus is more akin to that of the prophets than to that of the scribes. As we saw earlier, he introduces the methods of modern historical criticism when he appeals to the oldest history rather than to the

priestly codes as proving that the later conceptions of the law did not obtain in earlier times. The practice of Jesus upheld the general use of the institution; it was his custom to worship in the synagogue on the Sabbath. He observed the usual requirements of the law except where casuistical refinements brought it into opposition to the spirit of service.

Jesus asserted that the well-being of man was of infinitely greater importance than the rigid observance of the day. Institutions were made for men and not men for institutions, and the sole value of an institution was that it ministered to the welfare of men. *The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath*—Jesus spoke no more revolutionary word than that, and the representatives of religious privilege knew what they were about when they took issue with him. The saying is included in Schmiedel's "foundation pillars" among the "doubly attested sayings," and in "Q." Bruce well remarks, "For this saying and the parable of the gradual growth, his gospel is well worth preserving."

Jesus taught that attention to the physical well-being of man on the Sabbath was legitimate in so far as it ministered to his spiritual life. He taught that physical need supersedes the ceremonial law by his appeal to the example

of David; and that the ceremonial observance of the Sabbath must give way before any higher and more spiritual motive. On this principle the work of the priests and the helpers in the Temple was legitimate on the Sabbath and he found no fault with it. (Matt. 12. 5.)

There is a passage in *Codex Bezæ*, a very ancient version of the Gospels, inserted after Luke 6. 5 (which sounds like a genuine saying of Jesus, though not given elsewhere) which, like a flash of light, illuminates the thought of Jesus on this subject: "On the same day, seeing one working on the sabbath, he said unto him, O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law." What Jesus meant was that the breaking of the Sabbath law in obedience to a higher motive to satisfy the claims of duty or necessity is allowed, and the man is to be pronounced blessed as being free from the trammels of the Jewish traditions: but if his action lacks that motive, he is guilty of a willful disregard of the commandment.

Saint Paul and the Sabbath

The many references in the Gospels to Jesus and the Sabbath reflect the deep interest shown

by the early Christian community in the subject, and are no doubt an adumbration of the struggle between the Petrine and Pauline parties of the church, between those who wanted to hold to the past and those who desired the "glory of going on and still to be." "There is hardly any fact," says Harnack, "which deserves to be turned over and pondered so much as this—that the religion of Jesus has never been able to root itself in Jewish or even Semitic soil." Paul felt that there must be an entire cleavage with Judaism, and this blinded him to the real value of the Sabbath, which he classes with the new moons and Mosaic distinctions of clean and unclean. In the Christian Apocalypse, which represents the extreme left of the Pauline attitude, "the law is not even mentioned, and Judaism, so far as it stood for bondage to the letter of bygone legislation in opposition to the freedom of the Christian Church, is branded by its author as the 'synagogue of Satan.'"

It is clear from Rom. 14. 5ff.; Gal. 4. 10; Col. 2. 16–17, that Paul did not consider the observance of the Sabbath to be a Christian duty; indeed, it was a mark of spiritual immaturity to pay respect to its requirements. It was possible, he thought, to serve the Lord by the observance of a sacred day, and it was

equally possible to be a Christian, and a more mature one, and regard every day as holy. The great thing was to have a clear conscience in these and other matters of "doubtful disputations." The refusal of the non-Jewish Christians to observe the Sabbath was in the eyes of the Gentiles a very evident mark of the peculiarity of the Christian as compared with the Jewish communities, for the Jewish Sabbath rest was a subject of constant vexation to the Romans.

CHAPTER III

THE SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY

Upon no religious question has there been more confusion of thought and contradictory teaching by the church than upon the relation of these two great institutions to each other. Does the Lord's Day take the place of the Sabbath, so that we may say that the fourth commandment still has authority over Christian conduct and conscience? We shall see farther on, when we come to trace the development of the Lord's Day in the early and later Christian communities and to the present time, that a great variety of opinions have been held and propagated by church authority upon the question. We must, therefore, try to clarify our thinking on the matter.

Jesus did not abolish the Sabbath, nor did he introduce the Lord's Day by any specific word of command. As we have seen, he put little stress upon forms and observances and he gave the Sabbath a new content. The same is true of another Christian institution, namely, baptism. Jesus did not institute nor did he command this sacrament. He found it being used by John the Baptist as a symbolical means of

introducing his countrymen into a new way of thinking and acting; and his disciples, unrebuked by Jesus, copied the act as a means of initiating converts to Jesus' way. But Jesus did not himself baptize, nor did Paul, except on one or two occasions, and why he made these exceptions we cannot say. He had the same aversion to forms that his Master had, but he did not condemn baptism; indeed, he speaks of it as a symbol of newness of life in Christ Jesus. Both baptism and the Lord's Day were adopted by the early church as it was led by the Holy Spirit.

Likeness and Difference

That the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are alike in function and character, at least in their full development, is clear enough. It is also clear that the Lord's Day is *not* the Jewish Sabbath and should never be observed as such. In what are they alike and in what do they differ? They are alike, in the first place, in that each is a day of memorial or remembrance. The Old Testament Sabbath was a commemorative day, as the writer of Deuteronomy tells us. On that day they commemorated the beginning of their national life; it was a day of joyous memory and a holiday for the working people (Deut. 5. 12).

The Lord's Day is also a commemorative day, and this must never be forgotten, especially in these days when there is a tendency to turn it into a mere holiday. It commemorates the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, the first fruits of them that sleep, as Paul puts it. Thus every Sunday morning when it dawns brings to us anew the blessed truth

> "That Life is ever Lord of Death,
> And Love can never lose its own,"

and assures us that some day we shall see

> "those angel faces smile
> Which [we] have loved long since, and lost awhile."

But there is another way in which the two institutions are alike, at least in their development, namely, that both are days of rest and worship and thus minister to timeless needs of the body and soul of man. As long as man is man, the blessedness of observing the day, not only for physical rest, but also for spiritual devotion and culture, will never be annulled. It is this fact, as has been evident in our former study in Part I, and not any essential sacredness of the day, which has preserved the Sabbath idea through all the centuries. Like every great moral demand, it finds its sanction not in any outward command *but in the needs of man.*

So much for the likenesses of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. In what respects do they differ? They differ, first of all, in *emphasis.* In the fourth commandment the emphasis is upon the physical rather than the spiritual need; there is just *one* requirement—"Thou shalt not do any work." The people were to keep it holy, not in the modern sense of that word, but in the sense of setting it apart for a special purpose pleasing to Jehovah, namely, rest; and this idea was made the more imperative in the later development of the Sabbath by the association of Sabbath rest with that of Jehovah at the end of creation. The Lord's Day, on the other hand, was not primarily a day of rest. It was a day of religious worship and gatherings of the beloved community. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," writes the author of the Apocalypse. These words sum up the essential meaning and function of the Christian "Sabbath." At the beginning it was simply a day for community meetings for worship and the Lord's Supper. Later on it became a day of rest, supported and enforced by the civil arm, but the Christian consciousness has never lost the sense of its essentially spiritual character.

In the old city of Halifax, Nova Scotia, where the writer spent the years of his boyhood and

youth, there is a street that is closed one day in every year. It is a short street that was opened up many years ago from the blind end of Maitland Street to Brunswick, and was made from a strip along the edge of the Garrison Field, which is the property of the War Department. The street was never deeded to the city, and one day in every year barricades are erected at both ends and soldiers stand on guard to stop all public thoroughfare. If you inquire of the guard why this is done, he will reply that this is not a public street, but belongs to the War Department. But it belonged to the War Department the day before and the day after and all the other days of the year. But the War Department closes it *one* day of the year to keep before the minds of the people by this symbolic act the fact that it belongs to the War Department *all* the days of the year.

This may help us to understand the difference in our Christian thought between Sunday and the other days of the week; it is the Lord's Day, and thus a symbol of all our days. It is our Christian custom thus to embody great truths in symbols. We take water, the most common of things, and dedicate it to a sacred use in baptism and thus symbolize the sacredness of all things. We take one human act—the act of eating food—and we partake of the sacra-

ment of the Lord's Supper, and thus we consecrate all our acts into the name and service of our Master. We dedicate one house to the worship of God, and seek to symbolize thus that all our homes are the places where God dwells with his children. And so we call one day "the Lord's" so that we may realize that all our time is his to be used in his service. The spirit of Judaism was separation; the Sabbath was separated from the other days of the week. The spirit of Christianity is permeation, the Lord's Day is the symbol of all our time. To saturate life with God and the world with heaven—that is the genius of Christianity. Thus Sunday is like the flag. The flag is a symbolic piece of cloth, Sunday is a symbolic piece of time. Just as the flag calls us to loyalty to our country, so Sunday calls us to loyalty to God and the Ideal.

Dr. R. H. Charles, *The Decalogue*, p. 153, calls attention to other differences between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day.

1. "First the observance of the Sabbath is enforced in both versions of the Decalogue and throughout the Old Testament. On the other hand, there is not a single specific command to observe Sunday in the New Testament.

2. "The Sabbath can be legitimately observed only on the seventh day. On the other hand,

Christians treat the seventh as a common day, and keep the first.

3. "The Sabbath lasts from sunset to sunset; Sunday from midnight to midnight.

. . . . . .

6. "The penalty for breaking the Sabbath, as it was conceived after the Exile, was death; for the violation of Sunday no penalty was imposed for many centuries of the Christian era." [1]

Thus Christians who are Sabbatarians are faced by insuperable difficulties. Nothing can be more certain than that the early Christian worked on Sunday. Christianity began chiefly among poor people, many of them slaves. They could not regulate their hours of labor. For freedom to meet together and partake of the Lord's Supper, they were ready to sacrifice their lives; but no one suffered for the sake of an idle Sunday.

Who Changed the Day

There are in the New Testament only three references to the observance of Sunday in a particular manner. Paul urged his converts to put aside money for charitable purposes on the first day of the week (1 Cor. 16. 2). Shortly after this we are told that he preached a sermon

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Decalogue*, pp. 153-155. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

at Troas on that day which is mentioned as though it were a regular institution (Acts 20. 7). Then, a considerable time after, the author of the Apocalypse tells us that he "was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," though possibly he was referring to the prophetic "day of the Lord." Though there are but these few references in the New Testament to the use of the day for particular religious gatherings, that the matter was one of unusual importance is indicated by the large number of times the attitude of Jesus to the Sabbath is introduced into the gospel story.

It seems to the writer that we have an indication as to the movement of thought in the early Christian community in what is known as the earliest of all the narratives, the Gospel of Mark. In the second chapter the author tells us of one of Jesus' discourses which rose out of a question asked by the Pharisees about fasting, in which Jesus gives unmistakable indication of his attitude toward forms and institutions, even the most sacred and time-honored. Jesus had no use for any religious form which was not the expression of the inner life; he would have nothing merely put on, no motions simply gone through. Fasting was an expression of grief. "Can the sons of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with

them?" (In modern language, "Can the groomsmen be sorrowful while the wedding is going on?") "But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day" (Mark 2. 19, 20).

From this concrete illustration Jesus passes to the broader generalization as he contrasts his teaching with the demands of the religious leaders of his day. With that quiet humor which characterizes more of his sayings than most of us appreciate, he says the attempt to combine his spiritual teaching with the old forms is like trying to mend a hole in a garment by means of a piece of unshrunken cloth. To restrict his teachings regarding the meaning and use of life to the narrow bounds fixed by Judaism would be like filling old wine-skins with new wine. It was as though he would say, You cannot put these new principles into the old forms: they are not the natural expression of them. The new spirit necessarily breaks through them if it is to be honest and true to itself.

In the light of my contention that the many instances of conflict on the matter of the observance of the Sabbath in the gospel narratives adumbrate a severe struggle between the conservatives and the liberals—between those

who wanted to hold to the old Sabbath and those who, with Paul, would do away with the regimen of the scribes entirely—it is significant that Mark follows up this discourse of Jesus with two incidents in which Jesus comes into conflict with the Pharisees on that very question. Surely we have here a reflection of the vain attempt made in the early community of the Christians to continue the observance of the Hebrew Sabbath—that is, to pour this new wine of Jesus' teachings into an old wine skin. All that Jesus said was coming to be true; the wine was in grave danger of being spilled. So, led by the Holy Spirit, the early church gradually turned from the seventh to the first day of the week for community gatherings and the Lord's Supper. Out of this natural custom there developed gradually the institution of the Lord's Day.

CHAPTER IV

THE LORD'S DAY—DEVELOPMENT

That the week was observed by the Græco-Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era is clear from contemporary literature; indeed, there seems to have been a somewhat general custom of resting on the Sabbath. Near the end of the first century A. D. Josephus boasts: "Nor is there any city of the Greeks, nor any barbarian city, nor any nation where our custom of resting on the seventh day has not reached it." In spite of the evident exaggeration of this statement, it could not have been made were the week not so generally observed that all would know which day was Saturday. There are passages in Tibullus, Ovid and Martial which mention the observance of the Sabbath by the Romans. Horace (35 A. D.) tells us how he got rid of a bore by pleading that it was a special Saturday. And Philo, who lived in the first century, in his *Life of Moses*, asks, "Who is there that does not respect to the uttermost the holy seventh day which brings relief from toil and leisure to himself and to his neighbors; not to free men but to serfs also—even to beasts of burden."

Ovid is another witness to the wide prevalence of Sabbath observance in the Roman world. In his *Ars Amatoria* he is giving instruction to the young Romans who are looking for objects of affection how to go about their search. They need not go very far away; there are lots of girls in Rome. But they must go where they are, and he calls attention to the Sabbath assemblies. And the girls he refers to are not Jewish but Roman maidens. The satirist Juvenal remarks that the first symptom of a Roman family being influenced by the Jewish religion was that they began to keep the Sabbath. Certainly, the Sabbath seemed to the external world the most outstanding feature in Judaism. I cannot here take space to give further instances to illustrate the important place the Sabbath had obtained in the Roman world, but the reader is referred to an interesting study by Professor J. Hugh Michael, published in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. XL, No. 2, January, 1924, entitled *The Jewish Sabbath in the Latin Classical Writers*. Also to T. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaisme* (Paris, 1895, Index. s. v. "Sabbat").

Paul, as we have seen above, took the ground that Christians were excused from Sabbath observance, as from other holy days of

the Old Testament. He could not, however, easily wean his converts from Judaism away from such a traditional custom as a weekly day of worship. The *daily* communion and worship, which is spoken of in the early chapters of Acts, soon proved impracticable, hence a weekly gathering would gradually become the custom. For this the Sabbath was unsuitable as being observed in a spirit radically different from the liberty of the new faith. Of the other six days none so naturally suggested itself as Sunday, for that was the day of the resurrection. Eusebius observes that the Ebionites, an early Christian sect of Jewish tendencies, observed the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, and this practice must have extended to a wider circle, because the Apostolic Constitutions recommend that the Sabbath shall be kept as a memorial of the creation and the Lord's Day as a memorial of the resurrection.

Dr. A. V. G. Allen expresses regret that the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath, fell into disuse, for it represented "the commemoration of the creation of all things by God, a point of attachment to the natural order." . . . In the substitution of Sunday—the *Dies Solis*—"there is," he thinks, "the recognition of a kindred principle, so that the worship of the sun, hitherto so prominent in the nature-religions,

is henceforth to be transformed and elevated by the superior power of the Sun of Righteousness."[1]

How the Lord's Day Got Its Name

The name of the first day of the week current among the Romans was the day of the sun. The Jews, who avoided heathen terms as far as possible, called Sunday *mia sabbaton*,[2] the first of the Sabbaths, and the earliest Christians seem to have followed their example. But a more appropriate name was needed. The Romans called the first day of the month *Sebaste*, the emperor's day. What could be more natural than that the Christians, by the way of challenge, should get into the habit of calling Sunday *Kuriake*, the Lord's Day? So apt a suggestion would find ready acceptance. The author of the Apocalypse uses it without explanation (Rev. 1. 10). Ignatius (c. 110 A. D.), in his Epistle to the Magnesians, speaks of those who have been converted from Judaism as "no longer observing the Sabbath but fashioning their lives after the Lord's Day, in which our life also rose through him."

When the empire became officially Christian,

[1] *Christian Institutions*, p. 446. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

[2] Translated "the first day of the week" in Matt. 28. 1, Mark 16. 2, Luke 24. 1.

the new name quite displaced that of the sun, and down to the present day the thought embodied in *Kuriake* finds expression in the name for the first day of the week in Greek and derivative languages: we have *dies Dominica*, *Dimanche*, *Domenica*, etc. But in northern countries, which took over the Roman culture more fully and where the Romans called the days after the names of heathen divinities, Sunday became the more common term used. Hence we have in the Anglo-Saxon, *Sunnan Daeg;* German, *Sontag;* Swedish, *Sondag;* and the like.

To-day those who call Sunday "the Sabbath" are chiefly persons who have been nurtured in an ultra-evangelical atmosphere and ministers as they make pulpit announcements. The Century Dictionary puts the matter: "Sunday (the sun's day) is originally the title of a pagan holiday which the Christian holiday supplanted, and is the common designation of the day." The Epistle of Barnabas, by an unknown writer and dated near the end of the first century, says, "We keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in which also Jesus rose from the dead." The *Didache* (early in the second century) directs, "On the Lord's Day gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks." In the centuries following, the Chris-

tian festival was carefully distinguished from the Jewish Sabbath, with which it never appears to have been confounded till the close of the sixteenth century. The answer to the question, *Who changed the Sabbath?* is, therefore, the Christian conscience and intelligence of the early church as guided by the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER V

FROM THE EARLY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY TO CONSTANTINE

In the development of the Hebrew Sabbath, the date of the Exile formed a sort of watershed or height of land from which to take our bearings. In a similar study of the development of the idea in the Christian era we may take as a point of vantage the year 321, because in that year the Emperor Constantine (surnamed The Great, though it was chiefly in vices that he was pre-eminent) embodied the custom of weekly rest in a statute.

Little is known of this development during the first three centuries, though what we do know is enlightening. After Paul and the author of Revelation, our first witness is the elder Pliny, at that time governor of Bithynia. In his famous letter to the Emperor Trajan (194 A. D.) he tells how the Christians in his province held a service early in the morning "on a fixed day, before it was light, and a common meal in the evening." Ignatius in 110 A. D. insists upon the contrast between the Lord's Day and the Sabbath, as noted above. The *Teaching of the Apostles* made

provision for morning and evening services, this being necessary owing to the fact that many of the early Christians were slaves. Later on more time could be taken and Justin Martyr (c. 170) tells of a service which must have lasted at least two hours, for it included reading of Scripture, a sermon, prayers, and the Lord's Supper. About this time Meleto, Bishop of Sardis, published a treatise on the Lord's Day, from which we may conclude that the services of the day were being systematized. From that time onward the position of Sunday as a holy day was unquestioned, and we need trace its history no further at present.

The outstanding characteristic of the day was its joyousness. "In Sunday worship," writes Tertullian (second century), "Christians avoid every trace of gloom and put aside business which might interfere with prayer," Again, when he tells the Christians that they have more holidays than the Romans, he implies that Sunday, like a Roman holiday, was of a festive character. It is also to be noted that he compares the Lord's Day with heathen festivals rather than with the Sabbath.

Although it is evident that the leaders of the early church were desirous of avoiding contrasting the Lord's Day with the Sabbath, it became necessary at last that the distinction

should be clearly made. For one thing, the idea of a day or days especially holy was not in keeping with the Christian conception of the sacredness of all time. Clement of Alexandria (c. 240) says the Lord's Day is to be observed by putting away evil thoughts and by acquiring new knowledge, and Origen (c. 240) apologizes for the observance of Sunday as a concession to the feelings of weaker brethren. They, "being either unable or unwilling to keep every day in this manner, require some suitable memorial to prevent spiritual things from passing altogether from their minds." One hundred years later Athanasius wrote, "We keep no Sabbath day, [but] we keep the Lord's Day as a memorial of the beginning of the second new creation." Saint Augustine, while insisting on the festive character of Sunday, pronounces the fourth commandment to be no longer binding upon Christians. His words seem to be framed to exclude the idea of a transference of obligation from the Sabbath to Sunday. Chrysostom asks: "If you keep the Sabbath, why not be circumcised?" Ignatius speaks of those whom he addresses as "no longer Sabbatizing, but living in observance of the Lord's Day, on which also your life sprang up again."

Habits Hard to Break

But while the Christian leaders of the early church were able to make these distinctions, the idea that Sunday was heir to the Sabbath was all the time gaining ascendency among the people. The association of Sunday with the Græco-Roman festivals, as well as familiarity with the Old Testament cultus, would keep alive the idea that Sunday should also be a day of rest. What may be called the Sabbatarian movement in the early centuries came from the people. The leaders at first resisted it and then yielded to the pressure and sought mystical and theological reasons to justify their action. For instance, Saint Ambrose in the nineteenth Homily on Genesis writes: "God from the earliest teaches us symbolically to set apart one whole day in the week and devote it to spiritual activities." About the same time Chrysostom seeks to distinguish between the temporary and permanent elements in the Sabbath, taking the ground that the fundamental principle is that we should devote one whole day in the week to the exercise of spiritual things.

Imperial Rome Takes a Hand

Meantime another influence was at work to bring into the Lord's Day the idea and function

associated with the Sabbath. Glazebrook in an exhaustive article to which I am especially indebted for this part of my study writes as follows: "The matter is obscure and we must rely upon conjecture. As the social and industrial organization of the empire advanced under the *Pax Romanum*, the sporadic festivals of the ancient calendar became more and more inconvenient. The efficiency of labor depends largely upon recreation, but holidays at irregular intervals are not effective for recreation and sadly interfere with organization."[1] Before the Christian era Greek and Latin attacked the Sabbath as a rest day. This type of attack culminated in Seneca, to whom it was a worthless institution. "To remain idle every seventh day," he said, "is to lose a seventh part of life while pressing interests suffer by this idleness."

In time we can imagine Romans reflecting on the regularity with which the day of the sun was observed by the Christians, and wishing they also had a weekly holiday. Hence, when Constantine in 321 A. D. promulgated his edict it was received with popular approval. It is to be noted, however, that it is not as the Lord's Day that he describes this holiday. "Let all magistrates," the edict runs, "and people of the city, and all who work as artisans rest on

[1] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. xii, p. 105.

the *venerable day of the sun*" (italics mine). This law forbade Sunday amusements, commerce and labor. Country people, however, were exempted at harvest time, "lest by neglecting any suitable opportunity men might lose the benefits which the bounty of heaven bestowed upon them." Sixty years later, in another Roman decree, Sunday is called the Lord's Day, which is the first recognition of the name by the civil power.

What Constantine Really Did

Some have been so deficient in humor as to call the observance of the Lord's Day the "mark of the beast," an expression used by the writer of the book of Revelation to designate those who showed approval of the Roman emperor and the priests in charge of his cult, whom John calls "beasts" (Rev. 13. 16–17). If the edict of Constantine had been a deep conspiracy to involve the early Christians in worship of the emperor, there would be some reason for the designation of "beasts." But Constantine, on a time when he was nearly defeated in battle, thought he would try the power of this new Asiatic Deity of whom every one was talking. He promised, if he won this battle, he would become a Christian. He won it, and being impressed by the power of the Christian God, allowed himself to be baptized.

His Sunday edict was a concession to the new religion, which he had accepted, as well as an attempt to bring into some sort of order the numerous festivals of the day. It is the first Sunday law in history and became, for better or worse, the parent of a series of legal enactments and ecclesiastical decrees which exercised a great influence upon the life of Europe during many centuries.

How Laws Get Made

That Constantine was in no way responsible for the "change of the Sabbath" from the seventh to the first day of the week is evident to the historical student. He simply embodied in statutory enactment a custom which had grown through the years from the beginning of the Christian era. "Laws never regulate anything," says Anatole France. "When the authorities formulate a law it has long since passed into common usage. It can merely sanction custom. If it does not, it remains a dead letter. Above the legislator there are accepted customs. By whom are these established? By everybody, but particularly by the dreamers."

Though there was much to be desired in the moral character of Constantine, he was a shrewd political leader and organizer, and had the sense

to see the wisdom of a fixed day for rest and worship; and that the Jews and the Christians were right and the heathen with their numerous holidays were wrong. Various imperial decrees affecting the observance of Sunday were enacted in the fourth and fifth centuries which set a standard for the new nations that gradually arose out of the flood of barbarian invasion.

CHAPTER VI

THE MIDDLE AGES—AND AFTER

DURING the years between the downfall of Rome and the invention of printing, the human mind was subject to influences from which it has not even to-day escaped. Concerning this period James Harvey Robinson, writes:[1] "The great mass of Christian believers, whether Catholic or Protestant, still professedly or implicitly adhere to the assumptions of the Middle Ages, at least in all matters in which religious and moral sanctions are concerned." From now on, as Hobbes has pointed out, the church became the successor of the Roman Empire, and with all its resources, including the "secular arm" of kings and princes, was ready to defend Christian beliefs and practices against revision or question. To doubt the teachings of the church was a monstrous crime; murder was a minor offense compared with this. As a distinguished historian of the church has remarked, "the God of the Middle Ages was a God of arbitrariness; The more arbitrary the more godlike. By frequent interferences with the

[1] *The Mind in the Making*, p. 122. Reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York.

regular course of events he made this existence clear." This influence is manifest in the Sunday decrees which the church promulgated during these centuries.

Lincoln Steffens tells a story of his walk up Fifth Avenue, New York, with the Devil, which I have taken the liberty to abbreviate. They were chatting together and regarding the passing throng—when all at once Mr. Steffens noticed an extraordinary occurrence.

A man walking near them got a piece of pure truth. It was a very small piece, but it was pure truth—and Mr. Steffens looked at the Devil to see how that astute gentleman was taking it.

"'Did you see that?' he asked, excitedly.

"'Yes,' said the Devil, not in the least perturbed.

"'Well, isn't it very bad for business?'

"'It would ruin mine,' said the Devil, calmly, 'if I didn't know what to do about it.'

"'Well, what will you do? Pure truth—what *can* you do?'

"'Oh!' said the Devil, smiling urbanely, 'I shall tempt him to organize it.'"[1]

Well, if there is a bit of pure truth in the world, it is that men need a Sabbath of rest. The narrative which follows illustrates the

[1] From *The Century Magazine*. Used by permission of author and The Century Company, New York.

astuteness of the Devil's plan, and how the church fell into the net spread for it.

The Council of Laodicea, in 363 A. D., commanded the people to work on the Jewish Sabbath; and the Council of Orleans (538), while protesting against all Sabbatarianism, forbade all field work on Sunday under pain of censure, because it kept the people from church; while the Council of Macon (585) laid down that the Lord's Day is "the day of perpetual rest which is suggested to us by the type of the seventh day in the law and the prophets," and ordered complete cessation of business on that day. One can see here the increasing influence of ecclesiasticism in compelling the observance of a sacred institution, not from any humane motive, but by priestly theory, and, it may be, to spite the Jews. The wholly wholesome demand on the part of the people for a day of rest, was vitiated by the introduction of scriptural sanctions taken from the Old Testament, as, for instance, when Clotaire III in 660 forbids all servile labor on Sunday, because the law forbids this and it contradicts the Sacred Scriptures. This could have but one end, the identification of Sunday with the Sabbath, and its enforcement by divine command.

In the Decretals of Gregory we read, "We desire that all Sundays be observed from

vespers to vespers, and that all unlawful work be abstained from, so that in them trading or legal proceedings be not carried on, or anyone condemned to death or other necessary reason." Works of necessity (especially in the case of perishable articles or where time was important, as in fishing) were allowed on condition that a due proportion of the gain made by work so done was given to the church and the poor!

In 789 A. D., Charlemagne, a German chieftain and warrior, who received from the Pope the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, a title of Augustus which had not been heard for hundreds of years, promulgated a decree which forbade all ordinary labor on Sunday as a breach of the fourth commandment. In particular it forbade work on farms on Sunday which Constantine had expressly allowed. From this time on Sunday was the Sabbath, and decrees of increasing severity required its religious observance with a fullness of detail which rivaled that of the Scribes and Pharisees.

Making People Good by Law

For nearly five hundred years church councils were occupied with the question of Sunday observance. Stories were told of the dire things which happened to those who broke the Sabbath, as to-day uncritical people ascribe a

drowning or other accident in the pursuit of Sunday pleasure to the wrath of an offended Deity. In 829 plowing, marketing, and law business were prohibited on Sunday; in 853, marketing and field labor; in 1009, markets, fairs, hunting, and ordinary labor; in 1031, traveling, except in cases of necessity or mercy; in 1050, all servile work and all traveling; in 1221, the people were commanded to hear the whole of the mass and the sermon.

This catalogue reminds one of a similar series of Sunday laws passed in the early days of New England, and awakens the suspicion that the people were not easily brought to book by ecclesiastical authority. Evidence is not lacking that, in spite of the decrees, there was a good deal of laxity in observance, especially among the privileged classes. We read that in 1226 the prior of Walsingham held a market on Sunday, but granted half the proceeds to Sir William de Clare in exchange for other rights. We learn also that emperors were crowned on Sunday, which must have involved a good deal of labor. Nevertheless, the day was one of leisure and attendance at divine worship. All tasks stood over, and all men paid homage to their Maker, joyfully and reverently or superstitiously and superficially, according as they were disposed in their hearts,

and no one scrupled to take such recreation as the ecclesiastical convention of the moment did not deprecate. After the worship was over, however, the day was devoted to amusement, for there was not at this time any prohibition of Sunday recreation except dancing, the singing of ribald songs, theaters, and the races in the circus.

Sunday Observance in Merrie England

In *England* legislation on the subject began very early. In the seventh century Ina, king of the West Saxons, provided that if a "theowman (or slave)" worked on Sunday by his lord's command, he was to be free and his lord was to be fined thirty shillings; if a freeman worked without his lord's command, the penalty was forfeiture of freedom or a fine of sixty shillings; and twice as much in the case of a priest. The laws of Æthelstan forbade marketing, of Æthelred, folkmoots, village assemblies, and hunting, on Sunday. In almost all the enactments before the Conquest there were admonitions to keep the day holy. The first allusion to Sunday in statute law proper in England in 1354 (28 Edw. III, c. 14) forbade the sale of wool on Sunday. The terms "Sunday" and "Lord's Day" are used in English statutes, but the term "Sabbath"

occurs only in the ordinances of the Long Parliament, and Blackstone claims that its use is legally incorrect.

In the 16th century we find the authorities of the Roman Church concerned about putting a stop to the growing laxity of behavior on Sunday, which seems to have been devoted largely to hawking, gambling, sports, dancing, public feasts, and traveling. Peter Heylin, subdean of Westminster, whose *History of the Sabbath* is a valuable source book upon the subject, is an important witness, for he traveled on the continent very soon after the close of the sixteenth century. He found the people attending church both morning and evening, but spending the rest of the day "riding abroad and walking forth to take the ayre, or otherwise to refresh themselves, and following their honest pleasures at such times as are not designate to the public meetings."

What the Reformers Thought

The great leaders of the Reformation firmly believed in the divine authority and inspiration of the Scriptures and regarded both Genesis and Exodus as historical narratives, but they could not base the observance of the Lord's Day upon the authority of the fourth com-

mandment. Take the most outstanding of all the Reformers, Calvin. His words must have proved a stumbling-block indeed to his Puritan followers. He declares "that the ancient Fathers substituted the Lord's Day in place of the Sabbath not without special reason, for it was the day of Christ's resurrection, which finished all legal shadows; and Christians were admonished by this alteration not to adhere to a shadow ceremony. "Christians," he goes on, "should have nothing to do with a superstitious observance of days." The substance of the Sabbath, he said, "is not in one day but in the whole course of our lives." The popular opinion of that day, that the observance of the Sabbath is still divinely commanded, he put among the dreams of the false prophets. "There is no use," he said, with characteristic logic, "in changing the day and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity." The "gross and carnal superstition of Sabbatism" aroused his ire. The early Calvinists were certainly not Sabbatarians. Calvin himself had the strength of his convictions, for he is said to have played bowls on Sunday.[1] Cranmer in his *Catechism*, published in 1548, takes much the same tone:

Here note, good children, he writes, that the Jews in the Old Testament were commanded to

[1] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. xii, p. 107.

keep the Sabbath Day. But we Christian men in the New Testament are not bound to such commandments of Moses' law concerning differences of times, days, and meats, but have liberty and freedom to use other days for our Sabbath days, therein to hear the Word of God and keep an holy rest. And therefore that this Christian liberty may be kept and maintained we no more keep the Sabbath on Saturday as the Jews do; but we observe the Sunday and certain other days as the magistrates do judge convenient, whom in this thing we ought to obey.

Melanchthon teaches that there is in the commandment a moral part which still survives; the part relating to the seventh day is abolished. But the moral part, he thinks, requires that "on some day the people should be taught the gospel and the rites divinely ordered to be observed." The Synod of Dort recognized the moral part of the law and inferred "the existence of a certain day appointed for worship." Hooker affirms that one day in seven, or one seventh of time, is ordained for worship by immutable law. Luther was heart and soul against Sabbatarianism: "Keep the Sabbath holy for its use for body and soul," we read, "but if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake, if anyone sets up its observance upon a Jewish foundation, then

I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, or do anything that shall reprove this encroachment on the Christian spirit of liberty." Tyndale is not a whit less emphatic. "We be lords over the Sabbath," he asserts, "and may change it into Monday or any other day as we need." The view of the Reformers is summed up in Luther's *Larger Catechism.*

The fourth commandment was abrogated by the New Testament, and ideally there should be no distinction between days. But human nature requires a day of rest from labor: the soul demands leisure for joint worship: therefor a day of rest be fixed for all. We cannot do better than follow the tradition which sets apart the first day of the week.

(Compare the Augsburg *Confession* and the [Calvinist] Heidelberg *Cathecism.*)

It will be seen that the great leaders of the Reformation were of one mind on this subject. They held that the fourth commandment was abrogated, and all days were alike sacred, but that the body needs rest and the soul demands quiet and leisure for worship. Therefore a day must be set aside, and none was more suitable than the first day of the week. Thus they argued, with fine respect for those principles of Christian liberty for which they were standing as against the ritualism of the Roman

Church, and they had the authority of no less than Saint Paul in their contention. One wonders, however, whether animus against the Roman Church had not a good deal to do with their pleas for Christian liberty, for it is an error, shared by many people who have read history superficially, that the Reformation established religious liberty and the right of private judgment. It is true it set a fire burning in the souls of men which led at last to results at which the leaders would have shuddered, but nothing was further from the minds of the leading reformers than the toleration of doctrines differing from their own. They replaced one authority by another. They set up the authority of the Bible instead of that of the church, but it was the Bible according to Luther and the Bible according to Calvin.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONTINENTAL AND ENGLISH SUNDAY

THE philosophizing of the leaders of the Reformation upon the matter of the timeless element in the Sabbath had an unfortunate effect upon minds which had been trained to obey the commands of the Scriptures as the Word of God. To the great majority Sunday seemed to have lost its authority by being divorced from the sanctions of the fourth commandment; and there was a decided slackening in observance of the day, which finally had its fruitage in what is known as the "Continental Sunday." Heylin, who wrote in the latter part of the sixteenth century, says that in Protestant countries at this time there was little restraint. Sunday was much like other days; business went on as usual most of the day; sports and fairs were common, and were attended in the afternoon as much as the church in the forenoon. "So, generally," he observes, "the Lord's Day is not otherwise occupied by them [he is speaking of Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, and France] than a half-holiday by us."

In England, however, the observance of Sunday was stricter, for the religious reaction was not so severe as on the Continent. Nevertheless, there was considerable freedom in the observance of the day after the religious duties had been performed in the morning; and a pious man could write in 1537 with sorrow that "the Lord was more dishonored and the devil better served on Sunday than on all the days of the week besides." In Shakespeare's day, Philip Gilbert Hamerton tells us, the English went to the theater after the morning service in the churches; they enjoyed many active games and recreations, including dancing, archery, and leaping. There was an early English statute which enjoined the practice of archery on Sunday afternoon—as a sort of military training no doubt—and there are still to be found in English churchyards yew trees planted in those days for the purpose of supplying the community with suitable material for their bows.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England witnessed a dramatic struggle to deal with the question of Sunday observance. The English Protestant mind has an affinity with the Old Testament, and there was a manifest turning back to the Jewish Sabbath with its divine sanctions. This was hastened by the

scandals of the sixteenth century. This movement came to a head in the publication of a remarkable book by Nicolas Bownd, a Suffolk clergyman, entitled *Sabbathum Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, or the *True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1595), which "boldly and crudely claimed for Sunday the authority and the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and argued that it should be enforced by the state." The book had a tremendous vogue and gave rise to a controversy which lasted for a hundred years, and whose reverberations are still distinctly to be heard. Its first answer was the *Book of Sports* (1618), which was republished by Charles I, in 1623, and which proclaimed for the people liberty to enjoy their traditional pastimes on Sunday, except bull- and bear-baiting. This was followed by the Sunday Observance Act of 1625, which forbade the people going outside their own parish in search of amusement on Sunday.

In Scotland at this time a stricter Sabbath observance was enjoined, and Sunday golfers in Canada to-day quote the famous edict of the Edinburgh Town Council in 1592, forbidding golf on the public links, a prohibition, I am informed, which still prevails.

"Ignoring the proclamation," we are told, "Mr. John Henrie, Pat Bogie, and others were,

in 1608, fined for 'playing gowff on the links of Leith everie Sabboth the tyme of sermones'; In 1604 Robert Robertson and others 'playing golf on the North Inch at Perth in time of preaching.' Robert was fined 'ane merk to the poor,' and his companions 'had to comear the next Sabboth in to the place of public repentance of the whole congregation.'"

The Puritan Sabbath

The pendulum swung back again under the Protectorate, and in 1643 Parliament ordered the *Book of Sports* to be burned by the hangman, and imposed the Puritan Sabbath on the ever-increasing area their troops commanded. The *Puritan* doctrine contained in it the obligation to abstain on Sunday from all employments save those of necessity or mercy. It extended the moral part of the commandment so far as to embrace in it much closer conformity to the specific regulations of the Old Testament respecting the Sabbath than it was customary to connect with the Lord's Day. This movement of thought from the broad standpoint of the early Reformers reached its logical result in the Westminster Confession that the fourth commandment of the Decalogue is a moral and perpetual commandment so far as the sanction of one day in seven is concerned, and it added

that from the resurrection of Christ the Sabbath was "changed into the first day of the week." In the *Shorter Catechism* (1648) we have:

Q. 60. How is the Sabbath to be sanctified?

A. The Sabbath is to be sanctified by holy resting on that day even from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days, and spending the whole time in public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is taken up in works of necessity and mercy.

The effects of this statement of doctrine are felt for good or ill down to the present day. It is to be observed that the idea, so popular in our day, that the obligation of the Sabbath has passed over to Sunday, is quite a modern one. It speedily became the prevalent idea among the Puritans, whence it descended to most of the existing Protestant churches in England and America, but it never gained acceptance in Continental Europe among Protestants or Catholics.

Restraint and License

Turning again to our historical study, we find Parliament at this time promulgating successive enactments on Sabbath observance, even prohibiting "vainly and profanely walking for pleasure on that day." "In England in the seventeenth century," says Westermarck,

"people were punished for carrying coals on Sunday, hanging out clothes to dry, for travelling on horseback, strolling and walking about in the country."[1] "Scotch clergymen," he quotes Buckle as saying, "taught their congregation that on that day it was sinful to save a ship in distress, and that it was a proof of religion to leave ship and even the crew to perish!"[2]

It is not surprising, therefore, to find the pendulum swing in the opposite direction with the Restoration when court cavaliers and clergy led the way in a violent reaction from this overstrictness. To what length the court went may be learned from Macaulay's description of Charles II's last Sunday night. Of course this laxity did not go without protest, so the battle of the books continued. It's an ill wind which blows nowhere, and it should not be forgotten that this quarrel about the observance of the Sabbath and such mandates as that requiring that the *Book of Sports* be read in the churches, drove the Puritans to Holland and eventually to America.

In 1676 a compromise was reached, and the Sunday Observance Act was passed which sought to regulate trade, labor, and traveling

[1] *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, vol. ii, p. 289.

[2] *History of Civilization in England.* Reprinted by permission of D. Appleton & Company, publishers, New York.

in a reasonable way, making ample provision for works of necessity and mercy. This law forbade any tradesman, artisan, workman, or laborer to exercise the work of his ordinary calling, works of necessity and mercy excepted; it also enjoined attendance at divine worship upon all. The fine was, and still is, five shillings. This ordinance is still in force all over the British Empire, though in 1846 Dissenters, Jews, and Catholics were exempted from the provision for church attendance.

From the Revolution to the death of Queen Anne there was a better church attendance and observance of the day; but under the Georges there was a serious decline in both respects, and the evangelical revival under the Wesleys did not come any too soon. In 1781, a new Sunday Observance Act was passed which aimed at Sunday amusements, bear-baiting, and infidel propaganda on Sunday. This law was made use of as late as 1897 to prevent lectures to labor men, so that while it was helpful in restoring the credit of Sunday in the public mind, it wrought mischief when applied to later conditions. Certainly, Sunday lectures and amusements should not be the subject of statutory legislation except when they are commercialized, or when they interfere with the quiet of the day.

In *Scotland*, in the meantime, the theory of

the Sabbath was applied with vigor to social life. Not only were ordinary recreations forbidden but a ban was placed upon books and music which were not of an essentially religious character. "No recreation remained," writes Glazebrook, "but whisky-drinking and a great part of the drunkenness which still continues in Scotland may be placed to an unwise Sabbatarianism."[1] One is reminded here of the old story of the indignant reply said to have been given by a drunken highlander to a lady who asked him to whistle for her dog: "What, whustle on the Sabbath!"

The Blue Laws

In the *United States* quite a dissimilar condition prevailed in the North and South. New England was Puritan in character, while the South followed the Cavalier habit of greater freedom on the Sabbath. Everyone had heard of the Blue Laws of Connecticut, and the fable of the sea captain who was put in stocks because he kissed his wife on a Sunday morning on his return from a long voyage at sea. As Dr. Charles E. Jefferson remarks, "Wherever the story of the Puritans is related, the tale of that man's kiss and its consequences will be told as a memorial of them."

[1] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, p. 108.

What about these Blue Laws? In the first place, they got the name originally not because of their character but because of the color of the paper in which they were bound. In the second place, while it is true that the Puritans enacted very strict Sabbath laws—they felt that they must if they were to save the souls of the people and build up characters which had backbone—the term "Blue Laws" is usually applied to a supposititious code of laws which had its origin in the very fertile brain of one Samuel Peters, who, when he went back to England, took delight in seeing his countrymen open their eyes at his recital of the queer doings of the Americans. It was his object to make them out fanatics and fools, to work off a personal grudge—some say he was *sent* back to England—and so in 1781 he published the alleged Blue Laws of New Haven. The laws of the Puritans were strict enough in all conscience, but they weren't silly. They lived in a different age from ours and their problems of social and national life were taken seriously. Perhaps they lacked confidence in human nature; it is probable that they had good reason to. But they believed there could be no freedom without religion, that there could be no religion without worship, and that there was likely to be but little worship without the

Sabbath. Democracy in America and Canada has wandered far from the principles of the founding fathers in its respect for the Lord's Day as a conservator of religion and the ideal. We may wake up some day to the conviction that they with their strictness were right, and we with our slackness are wrong.

On the *Continent* the Sabbatarian movement aborted and labor on Sunday was common and amusements a matter of course, especially in Germany. In Catholic countries Saints days so eclipsed Sunday that it ceased to be observed with any sort of strictness. The morning was given to the Mass and the rest of the day to recreation, a condition which prevails in the Catholic sections of Canada to the present time.

CHAPTER VIII

MODERN TIMES

Learning New Lessons

The French Revolution marks an epoch in the history of Sunday observance. Karl Wilhelm, Baron von Humboldt, the German philosopher and statesman, speaking of his belief that six days of labor are the really true, fit and adequate measure of time for work, writes as follows: "When I was in Paris during the time of the Revolution, it happened that, without regard to the divine institution, this appointment [of one day's rest in seven] was made to give way to the dry, wretched decimal system. Every tenth day was directed to be observed as the Sunday, and all ordinary business went on for nine days in succession. When it became distinctly evident that this was far too much, many kept holiday on the Sabbath also, as far as the police allowed: and so arose, on the other hand, too much leisure. In this way one always oscillates between two extremes as soon as one leaves the regular and ordained middle path."[1] W. E.

[1] *Letters to a Female Friend*, vol. i, p. 271.

H. Lecky calls attention to the same matter: "Of all the failures of the French Revolution," he writes, "none was more complete than the substitution of a tenth for a seventh day of rest, which they established and tried to enforce by law. The innovation passed away without protest or regret, and the proportion which the Jewish and Christian churches have assigned was resumed. One of the first measures of the government of the Restoration was severe law enforcing the observance of Sunday. . . . After the Revolution of 1830 it fell into almost complete desuetude. In 1880, it was formally repealed." [1]

The French experiment had a marked effect upon the English conscience, and there was as a consequence a better Sunday observance which showed itself in increased church attendance among the middle classes, and a greater seriousness of thought. Its effect upon the laboring classes was not so marked. The industrial era in England brought about the crowding of people into towns and cities with little to do to employ their energies on Sunday, and Satan finds some mischief for idle hands to do. They wanted the means of getting out

[1] *Democracy and Liberty*, vol. ii, p. 109. Reprinted by permission of Longmans, Green & Co., publishers, New York and London.

into the country and opportunities for reasonable recreation in town and city. As these were denied them, there was nowhere to go but to the public house.

Hence from the year of the Revolution (1848) may be dated a new phase of the Sunday controversy. New social conditions demanded new customs. The desire on the part of labor for a larger leisure—a legitimate desire, for the end of labor is the attainment of leisure—tended to emphasize the need of Sunday rest; but it also tended to modify the strictness of those laws which seemed to dictate to what use the leisure of Sunday was to be put. This phase still continues and the Protestant mind is by no means settled upon the question. This will be spoken of later.

A Great Controversy

In England, in 1851, there was a lively controversy upon two points—should railway traveling on Sunday be permitted, and should the new Crystal Palace be open to the people on Sunday afternoon? Sunday travel and Sunday amusement—these are still matters of controversy. Nothing in modern times has done more to change the habits of the people than the rapid increase of means of transportation. Then it was the railway, the steam-

boat, and the stage. Now, in addition, we have the trolley car, the automobile, and the aeroplane. No doubt the desire of the people for change of scene in the open spaces was a wholesome and legitimate one. The strain and stress as well as the dull monotony of industrial labor created this desire. The trouble was, then as now, that the craving was indulged at the expense of the religious life. Also its satisfaction involved additional labor on the part of a large number of workers. Intent on claiming what they considered their right, the mass of the people did not see what was involved. Gradually shops began to be open, and trains had more numerous schedules, and many subsidiary industries were called upon to join the movement. Then, contractors who wished to complete their jobs with expedition began to invade Sunday. The plea was made that the competition of Continental industry, where the standards of living were lower, was so severe that the industrial supremacy of England was in peril. This plea brought forth the famous declaration of Lord Macaulay. "We are not poorer but richer," he said, "because we have for many ages rested one day in seven. That day is not lost; while industry is suspended, while the plow lies in the furrow, while the Exchange is silent, while no smoke rises from

factory chimneys, a process is going on in the life of the nation quite as important as any process that is performed on the more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, the machine compared with which all the contrivances of the Watts' and the Arkwrights' are worthless, is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labors on Monday morning with livelier spirits, with clearer intellect, and with a new corporeal vigor. Never will I believe that what makes a nation stronger, healthier, wiser, and better will in the end make it poorer."

It was twenty years before there was any legislative outcome of this controversy, but in 1871 it was enacted that the consent in writing of the chief constable or of two magistrates should be obtained before a prosecution could take place. No one took a more active part in the controversy, and certainly no one threw so much light upon the principles involved than did the Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton. His sermon preached on November 14, 1852, is one of the finest statements of the essential meaning and function of the Lord's Day in any language. He stood with the great reformers in distinguishing between the Lord's Day and the Jewish Sabbath; the authority of the former could not be placed on the ground of a divine

statute or command. But he had no use for the plea of liberty on the part of those who wanted not liberty but license. The Lord's Day he held was "the bulwark of our country's moral purity." But he pleaded for a broader conception of its function and especially for a deepening of the spiritual life of the nation. Let me quote at some length the closing words of this noble sermon:

The mental history of the ancient Pharisees who observed the Sabbath and tithed mint, anise, and cummin, neglecting justice, mercy and truth, is the history of a most dangerous but universal tendency of the human heart. And so many a man whose heart swells with what he thinks pious horror when he sees the letter delivered or the train run upon the Sabbath Day, can pass through the streets at night, and undepressed and unshocked by the evidences of the wide-spreading profligacy which has eaten deep into the nation's heart. . . . Let us think clearly and strongly on this matter. It may be that God has a controversy with this people. It may be, as they say, that our Father will chasten us by the sword of the foreigner. But if He does, and if judgments are in store for this people, they will fall, not because the correspondence of the land is carried on upon the Sabbath Day; nor because Sunday trains are not arrested by the legislature; nor because a public permission is given to the working classes for a few hours recreation on the

day of rest—but because we are selfish men; and because we prefer pleasure to duty, and traffic to honor; and because we love our party more than our church, and our church more than our Christianity, and our Christianity more than truth, and ourselves more than all. These are the things that defile a nation: but the labor and the recreation of the poor, these are not the things that defile a nation.[1]

These were much needed counsels at the time and they are needed to-day to clarify our thinking upon this question.

[1] F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, pp. 351, 352. Reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York.

CHAPTER IX

REACTION IN EUROPE

The controversies of these years and the effects of laxer Sunday observance, as well as the results of the French experiment, had a decided effect upon the minds of the people, and the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century saw a strong movement particularly on the continent of Europe for securing greater opportunities of rest on Sunday for the working classes, especially the industrialists. Even in anti-clerical governments like that of France, where the secularist influence was strongest, there was a movement for a better rest law backed chiefly by the labor unions and the Socialists. This new movement was due to a better understanding of the human machine and the application of this knowledge to labor and industrial legislation. It was coming to be recognized that man had a right to leisure as the end of his labor, and that this right was inherent in man's physiological structure: that all work and no play made Jack a dull and an inefficient workman.

Better Sunday Laws

In France, in 1889, the Chamber of Deputies voted a weekly day of rest for working women; in 1892 this was extended to cover the case of children; in 1902 the Radicals and Socialists, backed by the Labor Unions, carried the day in the Lower House with a bill prohibiting the employing of workers more than six days of the week, giving to Sunday preference as the day of rest. In 1913 in France no factories were open on Sunday and few stores except those dealing in refreshments and the like. The French workmen thus took the advice given them in 1900 by Charles Hobson, an eminent British labor leader, speaking in Paris: "In your city," he said to his audience, "I saw no evidence of that rest, repose, and quiet consequent upon Sabbath observance to be found in every town and hamlet in England, when the children repair to the schools for religious instruction, and the churches and chapels are frequented by those who seek the higher life. In my view the very first duty devolving upon the workers of France is to see that there are instituted by statute a six-day working week and an eight-hour working day; and then to recognize the seventh day as a day of rest, and thus honor the divine command, 'Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy.' "

To a greater or less extent what happened in France in the way of legislation for a weekly rest day happened in most of the countries of Europe. Hungary obtained hers in 1891, Germany in 1895, Denmark in 1902, Austria and Belgium in 1905, Russia in 1906, Italy in 1907, Norway and Greece in 1909. These laws contained many exceptions and in some cases became a dead letter; nevertheless, this movement must be regarded as one of the most significant of modern times.

What We Learned During the War

The experience of the Great War conclusively demonstrated the truth that the need of weekly rest is written deep in the constitution of man, the worker. The first year of the war in England it seemed as though national necessity might obliterate Sunday rest. Munition factories and many others were opened on Sunday and double pay offered for work on that day. The result was uniformly a diminished output. Moreover, the health and the morale of the workers suffered seriously. In November, 1915, the Health of the Munition Workers Committee of Great Britian gave an interim report to the minister of munitions, Mr. Lloyd George. The evidence before the committee, they said, had led them strongly to hold that if the

maximum output is to be secured and maintained for any length of time, a weekly period of rest must be allowed. "On economic and social grounds alike this weekly period of rest is best provided on Sunday; and the Committee are strongly of the opinion that Sunday work should be confined to (a) sudden emergencies, including the occasional making up of arrears in particular section; and (b) to repairs, tending furnaces, etc. (the men so employed being given a corresponding period of rest during some other part of the week)." Speaking of the foremen and higher management of the factories, the Committee record their regret in noting obvious signs of overwork. "It is of primary importance," they said at the close of the report, "in the interests of the nation that they should be allowed that rest which is essential to the maintenance of their health." The reader is referred to the full Report published in 1917 under the title *Health of the Munition Worker*. It is one of the most important studies of the relation of fatigue to efficiency ever made. Miss Josephine Goldmark's book, *Fatigue and Efficiency* (Russell Sage Publication), and *Psychology and Industrial Efficiency*, by Hugo Münsterberg, are also recommended. Thus as a by-product of the stress and strain of industrial effort in England during

the Great War, there came a new appreciation of the truth embodied in the fourth commandment. It is hoped the nations will take the lesson to heart.

CHAPTER X

SANCTIONS—LEGAL AND MORAL

In the United States there is no federal Sunday law, but most of the States have more or less satisfactory laws in respect to Sunday observance. Consequently, "there exists considerable diversity of legislation on the subject, ranging from the old Quaker laws of the State of Pennsylvania of the beginning of the eighteenth century to the modern regulations of the far Western agricultural and mining States. . . . There is no State, however, where it is specifically laid down that an employee who is forced to work on Sunday shall receive another equivalent day of rest."[1]

The author is indebted to Dr. Harry L. Bowlby, general secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, for the following summary of Sunday conditions in the United States.

Generally speaking, he says, the Sunday laws are quite satisfactory, although in many States amendments have been made, especially for moving pictures, baseball, and other sports, but as yet, so far as he knows, no State has

[1] *Report*, British Ambassador.

legalized prize fights or bull fights. In Massachusetts, New York, and Wisconsin, in work of a continuous nature, employers are required to give a specific weekly rest day to their employees, with the exception of persons employed in transportation. Transportation and other public services are considered within the range of what is "the good order and health and comfort of a community" and are therefore permitted. Public parks and baths, generally speaking, are open, although the commercial public park and public bath are not usually legalized by law in our Eastern States, and, so far as he knows, this is true in our Middle West and Southern States. In certain parts of Boston moving pictures are permitted on Sunday, but nowhere else in that State. In Connecticut movies are legalized for Sunday evening and baseball games in the afternoon. Similar provisions prevail in Rhode Island. Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire still remain closed to all these commercial invasions. In the Western States baseball is, generally speaking, permitted, especially amateur ball. Most of these States do not permit the movies or any theatrical engagements on Sunday. Ohio has within the past six years handed down four State Supreme Court decisions against Sunday movies. The West is more open to

baseball, movies, and even the theater on Sunday than is the East. Pennsylvania is an exception. A recent referendum in Massachusetts opens Sunday to outdoor sports and athletics, amateur and otherwise.

Not one of the eighty-two legitimate or spoken drama theaters is open at any time on Sunday in greater New York. Doctor Bowlby gives the interesting information that the Actors' Equity Association caused provision to be inserted in the new contract between them and the theatrical producers and managers that no theatrical performance or rehearsals were to be held anywhere in New York on Sunday, nor any other place where it was not the custom, or where the law was against the open theater on Sunday. This contract was signed May 1, 1924, and continues to May 1, 1934.

In Canada, in 1906, the Lord's Day Act was passed, which is no doubt the most satisfactory piece of legislation on the subject in existence. It differs from most English law for Sunday observance by its entire avoidance of the question of the religious use of the day, its aim being directed at Sunday business and labor. It prohibits all buying and selling and all exercise by a man of his ordinary vocation or calling, either by himself or his employees,

on the Lord's Day, except in cases of necessity or mercy. It forbids competitive games played in public for a prize or reward, and entertainments where a fee is charged, directly or indirectly, either for admission or for any service or privilege thereat. It grants to employees in continuous industries, transportation, telephone and telegraph services, one day of rest in seven; though this section does not apply to any employee engaged in the work of any industrial process in which the regular day's labor of such employee is not more than eight hours duration. It forbids the sale of newspapers on Sunday, and Sunday shooting, either for gain or in such a manner as to disturb the quiet of the day. It expressly permits any work of necessity or mercy and gives a considerable catalogue of ordinary works of that character; though the permission is not restricted to these forms of work. It provides that no action or prosecution shall be commenced without the permission of the attorney-general of the province in which the alleged offense has been committed. Besides the Lord's Day Act, there are in Canada a number of provincial laws which were passed before Confederation, which are still in force, as well as the old laws of Charles I and II. Provincial laws and by-laws passed since Confederation have been pro-

nounced by the Privy Council to be *ultra vires*.

The latest demonstration of the acceptance on the part of the civilized world of the principle of weekly rest has been given by the recent action (1923) of the Soviet Power (as it likes to be called) enacting a weekly rest-day law. In accordance with the animus of this Communist government against religion, the day selected is Monday: Friday, Saturday and Sunday being associated with religion by the Mohammedan, Jewish, and Christian nationals of that country respectively.

In this change of emphasis from the religious to the economic and physiological, as seen in both the Canadian and the Russian laws, we see a liberation of the human mind from the shackles of its pagan and mediæval inheritance. They demonstrate that religious dogma can be neglected as a matter of public concern, and reduced to a question of private and public taste and conscience. It is an amazing thing that this victory has been won in the formulation of Sunday-observance laws. The responsibility for the religious observance of the Lord's Day is thus thrown where it belongs—upon the moral and spiritual forces of the community and the nation. The action of Soviet Russia in adopting Monday as the rest day will

doubtless constitute a serious handicap to the Christian forces of that country, but we can look forward with considerable confidence to the swing back of the pendulum to Sunday; for the accumulated associations and traditions of two thousand years are not to be set aside by academic Communism, especially among a people so deeply religious in character as the Russians.

At the other extreme from the Russian position is the contention of Lord Hugh Cecil, in his book *Conservatism*, that "the championship of religion is the most important function of conservatism. It is the keystone of the arch upon which the whole fabric rests." True as is this assertion, there is no more assured lesson of modern history than that the state cannot exercise coercion in matters of religion. At the same time the state cannot overlook the interests of the spirit any more than the church can those of the body. The state has, therefore, the responsibility not only of providing for Sunday rest but also for preventing such misuse of the leisure so provided as to diminish its value to the citizen and the community.

The church must deal with the whole matter of Sunday observance in a wise and constructive manner. Many are sinning to-day against the

spiritual values for which Sunday stands because they fail to use the day in the interests of the higher life. To a larger and larger extent its hours are devoted to mere amusement. Recreation has its place, and an important place, in life, and should have a place in Sunday. It certainly ought not to usurp the place where worship belongs. Is not the fact that it is so doing an indication of our spiritual poverty? A prominent writer, speaking of the empty churches and the decline of religion in Great Britain, says, "I set no great value on the rite of church-going alone, as a sign and symbol of spiritual vitality. It is the soul of England which is empty. England has no time for God."

The desecration of those hallowed forms in which the spirit expresses itself follows the dulling of the spiritual sense. Where there is no longer any need for worship there is no longer any need for a house of worship and no great use for a day of worship. The whole movement of thought in modern times has been in the direction of a larger leisure. But what if our leisure itself becomes productive of fatigue and unrest and we return to our Monday morning tasks with hearts untuned and unenlightened eyes? "Beware," said Ruskin, "lest you make your leisure a nuisance to others and a boredom to yourselves." It is

increasingly impossible to keep Sunday as a day of rest as we increasingly fail to keep it as a day of worship. The spiritual employment of the first day of the week has been a great rock, in the face of a driving materialism, behind which the weak, the weary, and the overdriven have long found shelter. Shall we hold it as such, or shall we simply let it go? This is a challenge to the church.

Moral Standards

It is important that we guard by law a sabbath of rest for the tired body; it is infinitely more important that we use it in the interests of the immortal soul. To the Greek ideal embodied in Pindar's dictum that no one is great who is not great with his hands and his feet, must be added the Hebrew, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Ralph Waldo Emerson held in admiration the Sabbath, which he called the "core of civilization." He writes: "Christianity has given us the Sabbath, the Jubilee of the whole world, whose light dawns welcome alike into the closet of the philosopher, into the garret of the toiler, into prison cells, and everywhere suggests, even to the vile, the dignity of spiritual beings."

George Gissing, surely not a prejudiced writer, tells us in one of his books how once

he found a light in satirical references to the English Sunday. It seemed to him an antiquated institution and its observance somewhat hypocritical. Now he prized its restful stillness, and contemplated with regret the certain neglect of its observance which would come with the decline of religion. Another unprejudiced writer, W. E. H. Lecky, in *Democracy and Liberty*, a book written in the interests of that personal liberty which so many people are afraid of losing —people who do not like Sunday laws—says: "No one who knows England will doubt that the existence of an enforced holiday, *primarily devoted to religious worship* (italics mine), has contributed enormously to strengthen the moral life of the nation, to give depth, seriousness, and sobriety to the national character, and to save from being wholly sunk in selfish pursuits and material aims."[1] What is true of England in this regard is also true of those English-speaking nations which carried with them across the seas Christian standards of conduct.

Professor William McDougall holds that the marked increment of crime in the United States is due to the decline or lack of moral standards, due particularly to the heterogeneous character of the people. Standards are of supreme im-

[1] Vol. ii, p. 112. Reprinted by permission of Longmans, Green & Co., publishers, New York and London.

portance in life and conduct. The characteristic of a standard is that it does not command, it appeals. The national standard has no authority in itself, but its appeal is imperative. It calls men to loyalty to their country, even unto death. Sunday too is a standard. It appeals. It calls to God and the Ideal.

We need standards to-day rather than rules of conduct, ideals rather than commands. The modern world mind is dominated by two great movements, the naturalistic movement, which began with Bacon, and the romantic movement, which Rousseau initiated. Both these movements are characterized by a repudiation of authority. The day of authority is past. There was a time when things were so because someone said they were so. That day is gone for ever. The day of authority has passed; the day of understanding has arrived.

Let us not regret this, but, rather, be thankful. Let us seek to guard the Lord's Day by understanding rather than by authority. Thus shall we have the mind of Jesus. His Sabbath conduct was challenged by the religious leaders of the day, because it repudiated authority. He did, and allowed his disciples to do, that which was not lawful on the Sabbath day. Jesus replied by an appeal not to authority, but to understanding. The Sabbath was made for

man, not man for the Sabbath. No more revolutionary word was ever spoken. He laid the ax at the root of the tree of authority so far as the Sabbath was concerned, and at the same time he sowed the seed which germinated in time into the Lord's Day, which developed to meet the spiritual and finally the physical needs of mankind.

PART III
THE SABBATH IDEA IN MODERN LIFE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In Sophocles' tragedy of Antigone the heroine, speaking of ancient laws which sanction human conduct, "the unwritten laws of God which know no change," says:

> "They are not of to-day nor yesterday,
> But live forever, and no man can assign
> When first they sprang to being."

So it is of the sabbath idea; its origin is lost in the mists of remote and perhaps prehistoric antiquity.

We have in Parts I and II tried to trace the development of the Sabbath from the earliest times of which we have any knowledge. We have seen that it was probably associated with the early Semitic worship of the moon, our nearest neighbor of the skies, which the heart of the child and the lover has ever adored. About the middle of the ninth century, B. C., in the earliest recorded code of the ancient Israelites, a seventh-day festival was adopted, probably from their neighbors in Canaan; and the people were exhorted to keep it holy, especially in seedtime and harvest, when primitive

man felt most dependent upon the higher Powers (Exod. 34. 21).

Just before the Exile a new reason was given for the observance of the day. It was to be a sort of national independence day, celebrating week by week the deliverance from Egyptian bondage and the real beginning, traditionally, of their national life (Deut. 5. 12ff). It was man's day with no penalties for nonobservance. This remembrance of the goodness of the Eternal in their national history was to be specially signalized by giving their servants a day of rest. Still later, during the Exile, Ezekiel gave the Sabbath another meaning: it was a sign between the Eternal and his people (Ezek. 20. 12). Finally, after the Exile, its use as a day of rest was enjoined, not for any humane reason but because God himself had rested on the Sabbath after his work of creation. It was now God's day, and its violation was punished by severe penalties—even by death (Exod. 31. 14–15; Num. 15. 32–36).

What Jesus Did

When Jesus came he spiritualized the rabbinical Sabbath, and brushing aside the work of the scribes, restored its humanitarian character. The Sabbath, he said, was made for

man; it was the gift of God to his weary children (Mark 2:27–28). The attitude of Jesus had a profound influence on the mind of the early Christian community, for after the death of Jesus another day seems to have been chosen—the first day of the week, in memory of the resurrection. It was the "birthday of the Church," the Lord's Day, and became a day for gatherings of the beloved community. We can trace this development in Acts and the Epistles. At last Paul, who believed that the Sabbath of the Old Testament was abolished, seems to have indicated the Lord's day as a time for special worship and the setting of money for charity and the support of evangelistic work; not as legally required, or as resting on the fourth commandment, but upon the law of human conscience. It became a day sacred to Jesus and his work, and it may be, also, a concession to the Jewish Christians, who had not reached Paul's lofty conception of the sacredness of all days. It was not a rest day; its character may be summed up in the words of the writer of the Apocalypse, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." Not until the fourth century of the Christian era was rest required on Sunday, and then only for town people; and even then for centuries its sanctity does not seem to have been greater than that of other

holy days. It was the late Reformers who went back to the Jewish Sabbatarian conception, and the Puritan Sabbath was established with all the restrictions of its Jewish prototype, and with few of its "delights."

Thus the Sabbath idea persisted through the ages: first a lunar pagan day of feasting and joy, adopted by the Israelite from his neighbors in Canaan, and made to celebrate their national independence; then a rest day pure and simple, with general activities forbidden. Then Jesus rescued it for man and the early church transformed it, so far as Christian people are concerned, into a glad memorial of the resurrection and continued presence of its Lord. Later, by slow evolution, with the vast number of Christian people it became the chief holy day. Of course for Jews the Old Testament Sabbath still remains, based upon the authority of the fourth commandment.

Value For To-day

The second question of our inquiry may now be profitably asked: Why should we preserve in our modern life and civilization an idea and institution which had its origin in conditions so different from our own? Having dealt with the question of fact, we now come to that of value. In doing this, we must be on our guard

against an entirely too common kind of thinking known as "rationalizing"; that is, finding arguments for going on believing as we already do, especially where the belief is a convenient and desirable one. William Trotter says, "When we find ourselves entertaining an opinion about the basis of which there is a quality of feeling which tells us that to inquire into it would be absurd, obviously unnecessary, unprofitable, bad or wicked, we may know that our opinion is a nonrational one, and probably, therefore, founded on inadequate evidence."[1] We must therefore avoid the pitfalls into which the priestly writers of the Old Testament fell, who invented reasons for the observance of the Sabbath, and even rewrote history for that purpose. To many to-day the ideas underlying *tabu* are associated with the Sabbath sanctions: others settle the whole matter by quoting the fourth commandment. This idea of *tabu* has a very strong hold upon the elemental tendencies of mankind, and the best of us find it difficult to overcome its influence. We find it easier to hold certain beliefs "on principle," than to take the trouble to examine the grounds of these beliefs. This was, as we saw, the attitude of

[1] *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, p. 44. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

the Pharisees in Jesus' day toward the Sabbath, an attitude which Jesus had to rebuke, and which he met by showing the true basis of the law as not an end in itself, but a help toward the realization in life of the great ideal of love to God and man. Jesus showed that the authority of the Sabbath is not external but internal, not static but dynamic, and its observance not an end but a means.

Another instance of the attitude we must avoid in our study is seen in the distinction between sacred and secular, which would seem to be the persistence of the ancient dread of treading on holy ground for fear of offending Deity. "If a thing is held to be sacred," writes James Harvey Robinson, "it is the center of a defense complex and a reasonable consideration of the merits of the case will not be tolerated."[1] Against these tendencies we must be ever on guard in our study of the reasons for retaining the Sabbath idea in our day. Much of the literature on the Sabbath question is illustrative of this tendency. A satisfactory treatment of the question must therefore be positive and critical. We must accept the scientific attitude and take what comes. On the other hand, we must retain those truths of the inner life which are embodied in standards.

[1] *The Mind in the Making*, p. 92.

Our belief in the Sabbath, which inclines to be largely emotional, must become humanistic and religious.

We are on undebatable ground when we base our study upon the great word of Jesus: "*The sabbath was made for man*"; its authority is to be found in the essential nature of man's body and soul. If the Sabbath were made for man, it was made not for a part of his nature, as has so often been supposed, but for the whole. Man has a body, he has a mind, he *is* a spirit. This is not to say that these elements can be separated, for man is a sort of trinity-in-unity, as recent studies in psychoanalysis are so clearly showing. The relationship is one of the oldest riddles. Tennyson makes the "Ancient Sage" say:

"Thou canst not prove that thou art body alone,
Nor canst thou prove that thou art spirit alone,
Nor canst thou prove that thou art both in one.

. . . . . .

For nothing worthy proving can be proven
Nor yet disproven."

But this at least is certain, as Sir J. Arthur Thomson writes, "that organism and consciousness, are, in the experience of every day, interdependent. It is a relation there is nothing to which we can compare it; if it is a unity, it

is equally unique. We are mind-bodies or body-minds; sometimes we feel more of the one, sometimes more of the other."[1] In Browning's words:

> "Not soul helps flesh more now,
> Than flesh helps soul."

We shall therefore discuss the Sabbath idea in modern life under the three heads: Body, Mind, Spirit.

[1] *The Control of Life.* Reprinted by permission of Henry Holt and Company, publishers, New York.

CHAPTER II

THE MINISTRY OF SUNDAY TO THE BODY

The Sabbath, said Jesus, was made for man. Hence it was made for his body. Here Jesus seems to have differed from the religious leaders of his day. The Pharisees thought of the Sabbath as ministering to the religious needs of man alone; but Jesus knew better, and he did not hesitate to break the Sabbath in the interests of the physical welfare of people.

Many religions have shown contempt for the physical body, and there have been periods in its history when Christianity has done so. This is not true of the great religions of antiquity, nor of Christianity in its earliest and purest form. Your body, said Paul, is the temple of the Holy Spirit. Glorify God, therefore, in your body. A very large part of the ministry of Jesus and the early church was to the bodies of men.

1. Protecting the Human Machine

The ministry of the Sunday to the physical needs in modern times may be summed up in

two words: Rest and Recreation. The tired body needs rest, but

> "Absence of occupation is not rest;
> A mind quite vacant is a mind distressed."

Hence the need of recreation; indeed, the generic significance of the word sums up the real function of the Sabbath, namely, re-creation. This opens up the question, Why do we need rest? The answer is because of *fatigue*. This seems like a trite answer, but it opens up a large subject.

What is fatigue? The answer to this question may be introduced by means of some illustrations. When we went to school we used to be given problems to solve like this:

"If a man can dig 3 feet of ditch in 1 hour, how many feet can he dig in 8 hours? In 10 hours? And the answer was of course 24; 30. Now, this is quite true in arithmetic, and our teachers found no fault, but, as Bergson has shown, life has its laws which arithmetic knows not. As a matter of fact, if the average output of the man is 3 feet per hour, he will dig something less than 3 feet the first hour, and something more the second; and if he is kept too long at work he will dig considerably less than 3 feet per hour. Or take another illustration,

this time from Mr. Henry Ford's time books:

February, 1913—16,000 men working 10 hours a day produced 16,000 cars.
February, 1923—15,800 men working 8 hours a day produced 26,000 cars.

That is, fewer men in a shorter day produced more cars. Again, in the Bethlehem Steel Works, men loading pig-iron on cars had been accomplishing 12½ tons a day. Then Mr. Frederick W. Taylor, a specialist in scientific management, took hold of the problem. He had the men rest at stated periods of their work, and discovered that by a proper adjustment of rest and work they were able to load not less than 47½ tons per man per day, and were in better shape at the end of the day than before the new regime. In a bicycle factory, where similar experiments were made, in the scientific adjustment of work and rest periods, 35 girls did the work formerly done by 120, and the accuracy was two thirds better than before.

Mr. Taylor, speaking of the Bethlehem experiments, writes: "A law was discovered so simple that it is truly remarkable that it should not have been discovered before, to wit, that *rest must adequately balance exertion.*" Mr. Taylor thus states in physiological language

the cause of fatigue: "Throughout the time the man is under a heavy load, the tissues of his arm are in process of degeneration, and frequent periods of rest are required in order that the blood may have a chance to restore these tissues to their normal condition." These facts have been corroborated recently in studies in industrial fatigue both in Germany and in England, and had their strongest confirmation in the experience of munition making in England during the Great War.

The principle illustrated by the above examples lies at the basis of the Sabbath idea. The race found it out ages ago without knowing just why. So, wisely, they made periodical rest a divine command. Even to-day we do not know what makes us tired, though we give it a name and call it fatigue. Fatigue is one of life's mysteries, but a great truth has been learned, protoplasm balks at endless repetition. Life is responsive to change.

"All nature is rhythmical from the pulsations of heat to the vibrations of violin strings; from the undulations of light, heat, and sound to the tides of the sea; from the periodicities of sex to the periodicities of planets and comets and stars; from the alterations of night and day to the succession of the seasons, and perhaps to the climatic changes; from the

oscillations of molecules to the rise and fall of nations and the birth and death of stars."[1] Passing from Will Durant's poetic summary, it is to be noted that medical science has of recent years paid particular attention to the periodicities which are so marked a phenomenon of animal and human life. There are the daily periodicities of our sleeping and waking hours, recurrent appetites and functions which would seem to be dependent upon the revolution of the earth. There are also periodicities linked up with the changes of the moon, sex periodicities in man as well as in woman, as Havelock Ellis has shown. Darwin traced some of these back to the earliest life on the planet which was dependent upon the ebb and flow of tides.

The number seven and multiples of seven seem to play an important part in these periodicities. Shakespeare's seven ages of man is more than a poetic fancy, and has a physiological and psychological basis. It is said that certain maladies have their critical points on the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th days. Such periodicities as these, no doubt, had their influence in the development of the Sabbath idea in the

[1] Will Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 397. Reprinted by permission of Simon & Schuster, Inc., publishers, New York.

minds of primitive men, and provided a sanction to strengthen that of the divine commands.

2. The Nature and Effects of Fatigue

The question of fatigue in industry has been carefully studied of recent years. Dr. William McDougall is of the opinion that in no field of scientific research is there need of more co-operation between the various classes of workers, the medical men, the physiologists, and the sociologists; he believes there is no biological problem with which it is more necessary to keep in mind both the organ and organism in all its aspects." The chief concern in the investigation of workshops is output and the prevention of accidents; and in the protective sphere, work pauses.

The chart of Dr. A. Haegler, of Basle, which was published in 1879, in which as the outcome of observations he showed that each day was marked by a gradual failing of the nervous energy of the worker, with a return to normal conditions after the Sunday rest, has been widely circulated. Similar studies and laboratory experiments made in 1914 by Dr. E. G. Martin, of Harvard, corroborated the findings of Doctor Haegler. Early studies by the German investigators, Niemyer, Eschenauer, and the brothers Rabaud, pointed out the harm

done by *monotonous* occupations. This has been fully demonstrated in our present machine age.

Fatigue has been defined as a diminution of capacity for work which follows excess of work, *or lack of rest*, and which is recognized on its subjective side by a characteristic sense of malaise. Studies of the causes of fatigue would seem to indicate that it is due to poisoning. "The substances produced by overworking," says Mosso, "are drosses; . . . . fatigue thus, bodily or mentally, is a sort of poisoning by the chemical products of decomposition." Recent English and American studies indicate that this is due to the production of lactic acid in the muscles. During rest this acid is converted back to glycogen (or most of it is), which is a source of muscular energy.

The subject needs further investigation, and is getting it. Every one knows from experience that his perceptions are keener and his judgment more balanced in the morning than at night. Fatigue is a sign that the reserve stock is being drawn and one has begun to consume his capital. "Fatigue let run," writes Miss Goldmark, "is to be repaid at compound in terest."[1]

[1] Josephine Goldmark, *Fatigue and Efficiency*, p. 88. Reprinted by permission of Survey Associates, Inc., and the author.

It is important to distinguish between *tiredness* and fatigue. Tiredness is a subjective feeling accompanied by a desire for rest. Fatigue is a diminished capacity for work, and results from work. There are, on the one hand, the weary Willies of the world, who seem to have been born tired, for whom the ordinary metabolism of life seems capable of originating feelings of tiredness. On the other hand, there are men and women who never seem to be tired. For fatigue there is no elixir but rest. During the Great War it was announced that the Germans had originated a treatment which would ward off the threshold of fatigue, and which was used with soldiers. Careful tests showed that while the use of this remedy produced a feeling of well-being, due probably to the elimination of body wastes, there was no detectable increase of muscular energy or efficiency, while the average number of errors was not significantly different.

One of the most pernicious effects of fatigue is a lessening of self-control. Weakness and wickedness are closely related, and there is more than an etymological connection between holiness and health. It is well known that exhaustion of the nervous system lessens inhibitory power. The power to focus attention

and make it bear upon some subject of observation or study is the finest achievement of the human mind in its conative aspect and the chief mark of an educated man. As Thomas Huxley puts it: "Perhaps the most valuable result of all education is the ability to make yourself do the thing you have to do when it ought to be done, whether you like it or not." Sanity and insanity are, in the last analysis, matters of self-control, and lack of control is universally recognized as evidence of mental instability. Thus the organic feelings have a far-reaching effect upon the higher emotional life. "Those who work all the week," said Edmund Burke, "have no true judgment. They exhaust their powers, burn out their candle, and are left in the dark."

There is another even more important consideration, namely, that the architecture of the nervous system is so constructed that when we are tired the elements that are at the top which have been latest developed and which constitute our true manhood—unselfishness, gentleness, patience, and the like—are the first to break down, while the lower elements which we share with the brutes—anger, selfishness, cruelty, impatience—being no longer under control, become active and manifest. It is when we are dead tired that we say those sharp words to a

loved one which we would give worlds to recall and make those foolish decisions for which we can only have vain regrets. Fatigue is thus seen to be not merely physically uncomfortable; it is intellectually and morally dangerous, and may make temptation possible which may cost a man his reputation. Someone has said that the records of Saturday nights in this world of ours make tragic reading.

3. Fatigue and Degeneracy

The matter is even more serious. Long before anything was known of intelligence tests, acute observers warned the people of this continent of the consequences of the excessive and restless activity of the life they were living. One need only recall Professor William James' essay on the "Gospel of Relaxation," which was also the theme of an address given by Herbert Spencer in 1882, at a banquet to bid him farewell after a visit to the United States. He feared the ill effects on the best stock of the United States of their intemperance in activity, and expressed anxiety in his parting word. Professor James quoted the Scotch alienist, Doctor Clouston, who visited the United States many years ago, and warned them as Spencer did. "You Americans wear too much expression in your faces," he said. "You take too

seriously the trivial moments of life." Miss Maude Royden voiced the same idea after her recent visit to this country.

That these warnings were based upon a sound, if intuitive, diagnosis, has been proved by recent investigation. I cannot go into the question fully here, the literature of which is constantly increasing in volume. In a word, it has been discovered that the strain of modern social and industrial life on men, and especially upon women, can be traced biologically, that it is such as to impair the faculties of the great population of the children that are being born into the world, and the opinion is expressed by competent authorities that these conditions are such that only by a radical change in the present tendencies can modern peoples be saved from going the way of other civilizations in the past.

In addition it may be said that my own studies[1] and those of C. E. Woodruff, M.D.[2] of climatic influences on this continent have convinced me that unless we avoid the ill effects of overexertion uncompensated by Sunday rest and in general live more leisurely lives, we can with difficulty maintain our vigor and intelligence.

[1] *The Influence of Sunlight on White Men* (*Western Medical Journal* (Winnipeg, 1907), *The Hospital World* (Toronto), 1925.
[2] *Effects of Tropical Light on White Men.*

It was these studies which aroused my interest in the Sunday question.

While the alarming conditions due largely to fatigue cannot be wholly met by resting on Sunday, nevertheless much can be accomplished even in that way if the day is spent restfully; and the idea of weekly rest may be looked upon as a divine provision for human welfare ages before such studies were ever thought of. If our own country is to do its work and compete with the other nations, she must "remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," from the physical standpoint, at any rate.

One of the most recent surveys of the health of this continent is that of C.-E. A. Winslow in a recent book edited by Dr. C. A. Beard. The writer tells us that it is probable that disorders of the central nervous system "outweigh in significance disorders of all other organs of the body altogether." He also states that the provision of institutional facilities for the care of mental disease and defect to-day "is approximately equal to the total of hospital beds required for all other diseases, and we know that such facilities are grossly inadequate to meet existing needs."[1] The treatment in such cases is long periods of absolute rest and

[1] *Whither Mankind?* Reprinted by permission of Longmans, Green & Co., publishers, New York and London.

complete seclusion. Such periods are often only "Sundays in arrears." It is the complete change of mental attitude on a well-ordered Sunday that is so valuable from a sanitary point of view. A great nervous specialist remarks, "In the hurry and turmoil of these days, there is one text which is worthy of constant remembrance, 'Commune with your own heart in your chamber, and be still.' "

With the weakening of the nervous and muscular control due to exhaustion there comes a loss of moral control. The stronger the muscles are the better they obey, the weaker they are the more they command. At the expense of his vitality the modern man has realized in his life more pleasure and less restraint. The old Puritanism has almost disappeared from the upper ranks of society; it is retrogressive in all social classes. In the progress from the love and fear of God which characterized Puritanism to the Modernism and the cult of "service" of the present day, something has plainly dropped out, and something very near the center. What has tended to disappear is the inner life and the kind of control it imposes. Outer control by means of legislation makes a poor substitute.

One may also note the cult of futility by modern writers. To be futile and to live a life

of futility is regarded in certain intellectual circles as a justification and end in itself. This is the theme of many modern novels, dramas, and poems. They seek out by preference the dark and dirty corners of human experience, speak contemptuously of idealism, and hold up the morality of the brutes as better than that of civilized humanity because it is more honest. With these literati

> "Nothing's new
> And nothing's true
> And nothing really matters."

All of which indicates that from a moral as well as from a physical standpoint the preservation of Sunday is one of the most important and urgent problems of the day. This does not mean that the observance of a day of rest and worship will alone suffice to cure our cynicism and rescue civilization from its downward pathway, but that the idea of the Sabbath points to the way of rescue. All vital civilizations have been religious, all static and declining civilizations have been irreligious, as Spengler, in his book, *The Decline of the West*, has pointed out. This is the outstanding lesson of history. What the modern world needs is a deeper consciousness of God, and I do not see how this is to be developed unless by a wiser

use of the leisure and opportunity which Sunday affords.

4. Narcotics

There is an aspect of the Sunday question which we cannot afford to overlook. There is to-day an almost world-wide effort to deal with the evil effects of alcohol and other narcotics. Various types of legislation have been and are being adopted, and all sorts of experiments are being made in dealing with this serious social evil. Perhaps there has been a greater disposition to legislate about the matter than to ask why do men drink.

It is being felt to-day, as the outcome of careful observation, that among industrial workers the desire for drink has often sprung from their physical exhaustion, not so much from hard as from *monotonous* work. The fact that it has been found so difficult on this continent to deal with the liquor problem would seem to indicate that the desire for narcotics is caused by something characteristic of our modern life. Alcohol is not a stimulant, but a sedative, and produces a sort of artificial relaxation. It paralyzes to a greater or less extent the higher brain tracks which are chiefly operative in mental activity which accompanies work. Thus it would seem that

alcohol answers the demand of mind and body for relaxation. Nietzsche cries out against the modern spirit of progress, "Why does precisely this gloomy and vehement oppressor pursue me? I long for rest and it will not let me." This is the cry of the modern worker, and alcohol seems to answer the cry. It seems to have the power for a little while to release those who use it from the burden and enthrallment of the commonplace and workaday world, and bathe their weary souls in dreams. But at what a price!

The place of Sunday rest comes in here, for it provides just that quiet relaxation which the world needs. But this modern world, forsaking the teaching of its fathers, seeks on Sunday those forms of amusement which stimulate still more these cerebral centers which have been overstimulated during the week. Mr. Geo. W. Dickie, of the American Society of Engineers, said in an address at the Fourteenth International Lord's Day Congress, held in Oakland, California, in 1915: "The restless crowds that are carried hither and thither in railroad trains, in steamboats, in automobiles, and other means of transportation, seeking relief from the spirit of unrest with which they are afflicted, are but the outward signs of a condition which needs far other treatment than

legal enactment. This condition has become almost fundamental with the people of this country." Again he said: "If we are to bring back the people of this land to a proper observance of the Lord's Day, we must bring their thoughts and desires into harmony with that day and all that it stands for, so that it will be a delight." Speaking again of the difficulty of dealing by means of legislation with the matter of Sunday amusement, he says, "It is but the surface manifestation of a desire too deeply rooted for any man-made law to reach: only the healing power of the Great Physician can effect a change."

The same is true of those forms of amusement sought on Sunday as well as on other days. How do people spend their leisure? We complain that many have no ideals, that they are satisfied with the cheapest forms of amusement, that they read poor literature and prefer rag time and jazz to other forms of music, and delight in sensational movies. But why? Is not this also due to the stress and strain of modern life? I believe it is. Exhaustion paralyzes the higher activities of the mind and all that feeds men's mental and spiritual needs. Offer what opportunities you will to exhausted nerves and they will fall literally upon deafened ears. Fatigue so closes

the avenues of approach that books and learning, pictures, play, music—all these enfranchisements of the spirit lose their power. Hence, men and women run to those forms of entertainment that require the least expenditure of mental and moral power—just as the exhausted soldier drank his rum ration greedily. They are too tired for anything nobler, for nothing is great that is easy.

5. The Problem of Leisure

The observance of Sunday with its ministry to the inner life is closely bound up with the problems arising out of mass production and the consequent increase of leisure. A Chinese writer, Dr. Hu Shih, contrasting Eastern and Western civilizations, thinks the mechanical age of the West has brought an increment of spiritual values, because it affords the worker a larger leisure so that he may seek and enjoy the higher values which civilization can offer him. In theory that would seem to be true, but what the machine age has given the worker in time it has taken away by making the forms of pleasure as mechanized as is their labor.

Note also the deadening influence upon the inner life of commercial and industrial activity in mass production and distribution. Doctor L. P. Jacks, in his book *Constructive Citizenship*,

calls attention to the devitalizing effect of modern industry through the elimination of skill. I saw the other day a beautiful Chinese rug. I was told that it was the work of a single Chinese workman. All the elements of creative industry were there—stewardship or sense of responsibility, scientific competence, and noble aim. Now, picture the modern workman. Mr. Henry Ford tells us he can go out into the street and pick up any man and in a period of from three hours to three days teach him to perform any operation in his factory. The workman becomes a piece of machinery himself, going through a few motions over and over again. Think of the effect upon his character. How important that there should come into that man's life from week to week a day when he is no longer tied to his machine, but can become a self-directing and self-controlling human being.

But what if he spends his leisure in ways that are as deadening and devitalizing as his labor? There is no better test of the quality of a civilization than the quality of its leisure. It is not what people do under the compulsion of economic necessity, but what they do by choice after the work is over that is the criterion of their lives. Maxim Gorky on visiting Coney Island remarked, "What an unhappy

people it must be that turns for happiness here!" Granted that people have few opportunities on the other days of the week save to accept the mechanized and standardized forms of amusement forced upon them by the commercialized amusement agencies, cannot Sunday be made different? That is what we plead for. In the traditions and customs of the past Sunday has stood for release, and that is what we seek for in play. It releases from daily toil, but it also opens up opportunities for the enfranchisement of the spirit that we refuse at our peril.

CHAPTER III

THE MINISTRY OF SUNDAY TO THE MIND

1. The Art of Thinking

"And, friend, when dost thee think?" asked a Quaker lady of the poet Southey after he had explained with considerable satisfaction how he spent his day. He told her how he studied the Portuguese grammar while he was shaving, how he read Spanish for an hour before breakfast, how after breakfast he wrote and studied till dinner; in a word, how his whole day was filled with reading, writing, walking, and sleeping; and she replied with the pertinent query which I have quoted. It is a very needful question to be asked of this busy world of men and women: When do we think?

As a matter of fact, thinking is an art which is in grave danger of dying out in these days, not only because of our busy lives, but also because there are so many people who want to do our thinking for us. The press with all its merits is one of the greatest enemies of independent thinking—the press and the mechanism of modern life. *Things* are in the saddle to-day. With the fierceness of business com-

petition, making a living is likely to demand every ounce of a man's energies and almost every moment of his day, but it does not develop more than a small portion of his mind. A thoughful writer has said recently; "At the end of an intensely active business life the business man is mentally in much the same condition as the workman who for twenty years has made the same automobile part in a factory. He is ignorant of life; . . . he is ignorant of himself. He has not grown up, he is still a child; in any true sense he does not think at all." Preachers would be amazed if they knew how little the men of their congregations understand of what they are talking every Sunday. The great mass of the people do no more real thinking, exercise no more real initiative than the separable cells of the human body.

If we were to make a historical study of the influence of the Sabbath in the past upon the intellectual life of the races which have observed it for worship, we should find it a rich field for investigation. Take any man of to-day who has been brought up, as most of us have, to go to church in childhood, a habit which we have fairly well kept up as a nation, with some obvious exceptions. Think of the effect upon the mental growth and breadth of view

which listening every Sunday to the reading of the noblest literature the world has produced, and hearing an address which even at its poorest was of very much higher grade than was afforded by the daily newspaper or the popular magazine, so far as mental and moral stimulus is concerned.

The French statesman de Tocqueville, speaking of the secret of the strength of America, said he thought it was "chiefly because the spirit of the Pilgrim Fathers has so permeated the people that as a whole they take one day in seven to stop and reflect and worship." Goldwin Smith was of the same opinion, for he said, "It is the freedom and educating power of the Sundays which explains the average prosperity of America." The contribution of the Lord's Day, with its religious services to intellectual development through worship, preaching, and the study of the Scriptures, has been prodigious, in spite of the conservative attitude which the church has shown from time to time to scientific thought and investigation.

One may well ask why it is that Sunday is not made a more effectual means of deliberate mental improvement. While in the Christian consciousness and tradition Sunday is of a religious character, religion connects itself natu-

rally with all great subjects of human thought, and leads to and aids the study of all. God is in nature. God is in history. In many churches to-day open forums are conducted, at which persons who are able to speak with authority give addresses upon scientific and other subjects, followed by discussion. Thomas Huxley years ago pled that some part of Sunday be used for "the purpose of instructing those who have no other leisure in a knowledge of the phenomena of nature and of man's relation to nature." Thus the church is able to minister to the intelligence of the community. Sunday ought not to remain the dull, fruitless season it now is to multitudes. It may be clothed with a new interest, a new sanctity. It may give impulse to a nation's soul.

Especially with the children. We should open the windows of our children's souls by giving them books, and keep them open by encouraging the reading habit. There is no better time for doing this than Sunday. By giving our children, and especially by telling our children great stories on Sunday, we start them thinking and dreaming of the fundamental things in life—love and truth, honor and kindliness and loyalty—which must be built into their characters if they are to be the men and women we desire them to be.

2. How Sunday May Help

Mr. Arnold Bennett, in a little book from which we have the privilege of quoting, makes a wise contribution to the subject in hand. He is dealing with the problem of the man who has no time to read. With Bennett to *live* means more than simply to vegetate or to go through with the daily routine of business or professional life. One must live with his mind as well as with his muscles, his cerebrum as well as with his spinal cord. The man he is trying to help really wants to live in this larger sense, not simply to muddle through. "I want to exceed my program," he says, "I am living a bit; I want to live more. But I really cannot do another day's work on the top of my official day." Bennett makes a number of wise suggestions for finding bits of time here and there in the midst of the busy day for mental improvement, and then adds, "You will still have the terrific wealth of forty-four hours between 2 P. M. Saturday and 10 A. M. Monday." Such hours as these must be sacred, sacred as a dramatic rehearsal or a tennis match, he declares. "Instead of saying, 'Sorry I can't see you, old chap, but I have to run off to the tennis club,' you must say, '. . . but I have to work.' This, I admit, is intensely difficult to say. Tennis is so much more

urgent than the immortal soul!"[1] Bennett thinks that is one thing Sunday is given us for, in part at least—the cultivating of our minds; and he is right!

Bennett's suggestion may be carried out in a much more efficient manner than he suggests if we will recognize the culture which comes from the study on Sunday of the Christian Scriptures. There appeared a few years ago a newspaper article entitled "Education without College," based upon the biographies of two men, Mr. George Cadbury, the English cocoa manufacturer, and Robert C. Ogden, a great retail merchant of the United States. Both these men were put to business when they were young. "Neither of them ever went to college," says the writer, Mr. P. W. Wilson. "Yet each in his way was a man of high culture, of audacious initiative, of bold ideals. And these men, though apparently uneducated, had taste and exquisite taste for the best words. . . . A letter from Gladstone to Cadbury might have behind it the background of Eton and Oxford, the savor of Homer and Vergil, the diction of agelong theology; but it was not better expressed than a letter from Cadbury to Gladstone. . . . Ogden too wrote and spoke

[1] *How to Live on Twenty-four Hours a Day.* Reprinted by permission of Doubleday, Doran and Company.

much, but never spoke or wrote except well. His mind was accurate; his style was exact. Yet, like Cadbury, he clothed his ideas in terms which were often true eloquence."

How came these men to have letters, having never learned? The secret is simple enough. These men had their university and that university was a Sunday school. As Sunday-school teachers, what these men, Ogden and Cadbury, did was to maintain in their lives the study of the classics. . . . "Their classics were 'inspired.' . . . Amid the ephemeral, the degenerate, the careless in modern literature and journalism, they never ceased to hear the music of the Bible of King James, and it was the music that was echoed in their utterances. They practiced the formidable brevity of Scripture."

"As language the plays of Shakespeare himself," says Mr. Wilson, "do not approach in uniform excellence the literary standard of the Bible. I take a verse at random—from the death of Ananias: 'And the young men arose, wound him up and carried him out, and buried him.' It is not merely narrative, it is a funeral march; it is utter dirge. The light vowel in 'carried' is as if the bearers stepped into the open air. The dull vowel in 'buried' takes you into the tomb. . . .

"In thus reading the Bible and teaching it," the author goes on, "as Ogden and Cadbury did, they acquired a talisman which rendered them, as merchants, the equal in the realm of the mind of the scholars and clergy. . . . It was in the Bible that John Bunyan found the cadences of his *Pilgrim's Progress*, and John Bright the majestic simplicity of his speeches, and Abraham Lincoln his Gettysburg address. And is it to be doubted," the writer concludes, "whether any statesman, any writer in the countries which speak English, has risen to real eloquence without having, as it were, the Bible in him?" [1]

This long quotation is given because it illustrates admirably by concrete instance the value of the Lord's Day, with its study of the Scriptures, in the development of the intellectual powers and the acquiring of literary taste. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that our greatest English writers have been the men who best knew their Bibles. Of men as far apart in their view of life as Byron and Ruskin, it could with equal truthfulness be said that their mastery of style was largely due to their perfect familiarity with the English Bible.

There is another important way in which

[1] Literary Review, New York Evening Post. Reprinted by permission of authors and publishers.

Sunday may minister to the mind. Henry Rutgers Marshall, in *Instinct and Reason*, develops the idea that the function of religion is to give pause to life, so that the deep voices of the soul may make themselves heard, and one may "hearken what the inner spirit sings."

We live in a material world. Six days of the week we are concerned with spatial relation, with things that can be weighed and measured. These are the things with which science and commerce deal. They are the natural concern of the rational intellect. But the heart has its reasons, as Pascal has observed, which the mind knows not. It refuses to permit mere spatial and measurable relations to be the criterion of reality. Deeper than the rational mind, wider than the rational universe lie the bases and roots of life.

Alongside the crass materialism of our age we see another influence at work. Modern science has received some severe rebuffs of late as it has sought to penetrate beneath the surface of reality, for it has found there regions where its laws will not work. If I understand Whitehead and Eddington, it looks as though physics were invading the realm of metaphysics. Moreover, the new psychology, the philosophy of intuition, the discovery of the subconscious and the mysterious power of

suggestion, the indisputable miracles of faith healing, the outcome of the inquiries of the Society for Psychical Research—what are they but a recognition in terms of human experience, and not of the logical mind, of the supremacy of the life of the spirit?

For many, religion has ceased to be spiritual because it is not whole-heartedly believed, and it is not so believed because it is not based in mystical experience. It has become humanitarian, philanthropic, interested in social betterment and uplift. The creative instinct in religion as well as in art and literature is weak. We have a passion for regulating the lives of other people, but we seem to be unable to regulate our own. Never has humanity had such a sense of failure, and its weariness of spirit is because it cannot solve its own inner problems. We need to recognize that, as Ratenau puts it: "We are not here for the sake of possessions, nor for the sake of power, nor for the sake of happiness. We are here that we may elucidate the divine elements of the human spirit." "I believe in the Holy Ghost." This statement of the Apostles' Creed is in the need of emphasis in our day.

Sunday comes into our lives week by week, and asserts that this also is a way of knowledge, a way not vague, leading to things not illusory,

and to remind us that the wisest and best of men in the past found and walked in that way, and so walking entered into a peace which passeth understanding.

CHAPTER IV

THE MINISTRY OF SUNDAY TO THE SPIRIT

"I WAS in the Spirit on the Lord's day."—Rev. 1. 10.

1. THE PRESENT SCENE

Throughout the warp and woof of that fine literary fabric, the *Outline of History*, which Mr. H. G. Wells has so skillfully woven for the English-speaking peoples, there runs, like a golden thread, the idea of religion and the paramount part it has played in the drama of history and the evolution of man. There is hardly a chapter in the book where the writer does not pause to point out how it was religion which lifted a people above the sordid struggles for political power or commercial dominance to loftier ideals of humanity, and how it was through a loss of religion that nations came to their decline and fall.

Never perhaps in the long period of time from the dawn of history in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates did the race so need the stabilizing and inspiring power of religion as to-day, when we find ourselves in danger of falling into the same moral vacuum into which the Roman Empire fell. We are living in the

midst of one of those immense upheavals of human history which Wells recounts as happening from time to time—perhaps the greatest of them all—and we see the curtain rising upon an entirely new world-order. We are witnessing to-day the emergence of causes and the marshaling of forces unknown in the textbooks, which will mold history for thousands of years to come.

In the midst of this fall of empires and crash of worlds, the peoples are, for the most part, seeking amusement and engaging in extravagance like soldiers on leave bent upon making the most of the few hours at their command before they go back to face death once more. One of the chief functions the Sabbath has to perform is to give pause to life in its onward course, to make a quiet in the midst of life. On that day we sing with Whittier,

> "Drop thy still dews of quietness,
> Till all our strivings cease;
> Take from our souls the strain and stress,
> And let our ordered lives confess
> The beauty of thy peace." [1]

2. The Inner Life

That is the function of religion, and preeminently of the Sabbath. Throughout the

[1] Reprinted by permission of Houghton Mifflin Company, publishers, Boston.

ages of the past it has come week by week into the midst of man's busy life with its command: "Stop! Look! Listen"! The Sabbath is not, as Sabatier has pointed out, an ecclesiastical but a religious institution. It is a part of primitive religion, as we have seen, and its law is grounded in the necessities of man's nature.

There is a passage in the writings of Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton, in which he speaks of the quiet period which comes at eventide "when the work of the day is done, when the mind has ceased its tension, when the passions are lulled to rest . . . by the spell of the quiet, starlit sky; it is then amidst the silence of the lull of all the lower parts of our nature, that the soul comes forth to do its work. Then the peculiar strange work of the soul which the intellect cannot do—meditation begins. Awe and worship and wonder are in full exercise; and Love begins then in its purest form of mystic adoration and pervasive and undefined tenderness—separate from all that is coarse and earthly—swelling as if it would impress the All in its desire to place and lose itself in the sea of the love of God. This is the rest of the soul—the exercise and play of the nobler powers."[1] Such a period Sunday introduces week by week to mankind.

[1] *Sermons*, p. 85.

"Breathe through the pulses of desire,
Thy coolness and thy balm,
Bid sense be dumb, bid flesh retire,
Speak through the earthquake, wind and fire,
O still small world of calm." (Whittier.)

No truth has been brought out more clearly by recent studies in the history and the psychology of religion than the fact that man is "incurably religious," as a brilliant Frenchman has put it. Everywhere and always, in all stages of his development and in all ranges of his environment, man has been a worshiping being. There is Someone or Something, a Person or an Ideal, better, nobler, holier than he. Toward this perfection one should look with reverence and desire. Without it one becomes incomplete. Is there any man who has not this attitude of mind and heart? God hath set eternity in the heart of man, said Quoheleth, and to the same end are the words of Saint Augustine—"Thou hast created us for thyself, thou hast redeemed us for thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in thee."

"What greater calamity," writes Emerson, "can fall upon a nation than loss of worship? Then all things go to decay. Genius leaves the temple to haunt the senate and the market place; Literature becomes frivolous; Science becomes cold. The eye of Youth is not lightened

by the hope of other worlds, and Age is without honor. Society lives for trifles and when men die we do not honor them." This is the danger which threatens us to-day.

It seems to me too that the Sunday service in most evangelical churches, where the sermon has the chief place of importance, does not meet the needs of the modern worker and professional man as well as the more ritualistic service of liturgical churches, where attention is paid to those forms of worship which appeal to the heart and the æsthetic senses. In a study made a short time ago of the attitude of men and women to the church I had letters from over a hundred persons in the Province of Alberta, Canada. The desire for a simpler form of worship which made its appeal to the heart rather than to the intellect was voiced again and again.

3. Wanted—Greater Souls

M. Paul Valery, in a recent book, Variety, dealing with the spiritual and moral damage of the Great War, writes: "La persopolis spirituelle n'est pas moin ravagée que la Suse materielle." He writes: "The great virtues of the German people have bred more ills than laziness ever created vices. We have seen with our own eyes the conscientious industry, the best-grounded scholarship, the most earnest disci-

pline and application used for the most terrible ends. So many horrors could not have been possible without so many virtues. Certainly, it needed a vast science to kill so many men, to dissipate so much of the good things of life, to raze to the ground so many cities in so short a time; but it needed just as much *moral qualities.* Knowledge and Duty, are you then suspect?" [1]

This is the grave danger which threatens the world to-day, namely, that our knowledge and our science should be devoted to ends of ruin—a danger against which some of the wisest of our writers are constantly warning us. Hitherto, the task of mankind has been to subdue Nature and make her obedient to his will. To-day the task is to make the soul of man worthy of the conquests he has achieved. We believed our progress in a mechanical way would continue with constantly accelerated velocity. To-day we find ourselves abruptly face to face with the truth that the greater our command over nature, the greater of soul we must be to exercise that command, and that we lack that essential quality to such an extent as to be in grave danger of being destroyed by the very instruments of our invention. "If Europe is to be saved," says Keyserling, "it

[1] Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company, publishers, New York.

must be by changing the hearts of men." Only religion can do that—religion which is the conscious voluntary union of men with God as morality is their conscious, voluntary union with the race.

This is the function of the Lord's Day—it brings us into conscious union with God, it performs a service like unto worship, for which, indeed, it affords quiet and leisure. I see a little child kneeling at his mother's knee learning a simple prayer:

> "Now I lay me down to sleep,
> I pray thee, Lord, my soul to keep;
> If I should die before I wake,
> I pray thee, Lord, my soul to take."

or maybe it is:

> "Jesus, tender Shepherd, hear me,
> Bless thy little lamb to-night;
> Through the darkness be thou near me,
> Keep me safe till morning light;"

and as the child grows up into boyhood and then to adult manhood, every night as he retires one can imagine him kneeling at his bedside offering a prayer to God. Only a habit, you say, only a form; and no doubt often it is little more, but it is a form which brings the man at least once every day of his life into

fellowship with his God. So Sunday comes into my life and yours week by week. It comes and calls us. All the other days of the week we are engaged necessarily, for a man must live, with the material side of life: what we shall eat and what we shall drink and wherewithal we shall be clothed. Then Sunday comes and calls us to other things—the kingdom of God and his righteousness, that we may recognize our responsibility for helping to establish that kingdom by incarnating in our own lives that righteousness. It comes to bring us into conscious union with God. This is the ministry of the Lord's Day to the spiritual life of men.

4. The Consciousness of God

Do we need this ministry to-day? Never have we needed it more! It is a new vision of God, a new and more vivid sense of his presence, which the world needs more than all else. For what is our supreme duty—what must we seek to inspire our youth to do—what but the making of a new and better world! "The old order of things into which we were born," said General Smuts at the end of the Peace Conference, "lies in ruins and we are called upon not to piece together the broken fragments, but to reshape the world on new lines,

to take part in the great creative task of bringing a new order into being." That is just what we thought we were doing during the Great War. That war has been over for ten years and we haven't a new world nor a better world. Power and pleasure, pagan ideals, cast their nets to catch the souls of men as they did in 1914. Power is the goal of the state, and pleasure, to a degree alarming to all thinking people, is the goal of the people. What is the trouble? Too much have we lost God. He is not in the councils of the statesmen; he is not in the hearts of the people. Even the church has too much lost the sense of spiritual reality and is concerned to-day with theological niceties—dividing itself into Fundamentalists and Modernists over matters which are separated by infinite diameters from religion —the life of God in the soul of man. Is this a time to let Sunday go with its call to religion and the ideal? One may in all seriousness ask whether without Sunday the Church of Christ as a visible society could exist on earth. Was it not Voltaire who said once, "If you want to kill Christianity you must abolish the Sunday"?

The most wonderful vision of a new world in all literature is to be found in the latter part of the book of Revelation. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: . . . And I John

saw the holy city . . . coming down from God out of heaven, . . . And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying. Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." Only thus shall we get a new and better world.

And that is what Sunday does. It seeks to bring God and the consciousness of religion into the midst of the life of the community. We have been trying to resettle the world upon business principles. Business principles are not enough to sustain such a settlement. It must rest at bottom on religion, which civilization has always rested on: it must rest on Christianity. This is the great truth which the Sabbath idea has ever sought to keep before the minds and hearts of men; it is its ministry to the spiritual life. This truth is expressed in the following poem by Sir E. Bulwer Lytton:

"Fresh glides the brook and blows the gale,
Yet yonder halts the quiet mill!
The whirtling wheel, the rushing sail,
How motionless and still!

"Six days of toil, poor child of Cain,
Thy strength the slave of Want may be;
The seventh—thy limbs escape the chain—
A god hath made thee free!

"Ah, tender was the Law that gave
This holy respite to the breast,
To breathe the gale, to watch the wave,
And know—the wheel may rest!

"But where the waves the gentlest glide
What image charms, to lift thine eyes?
The spire reflected on the tide
Invites thee to the skies.

"To teach the soul its nobler worth
This rest from mortal toils is given;
Go, snatch the brief reprieve from earth,
And pass a guest to heaven.

"They tell thee in their dreaming school,
Of Power from old Dominion hurled,
When rich and poor, with juster rule,
Shall share the altered world.

"Alas! since Time itself began,
That fable hath but fooled the hour;
Each age ripens that Power in Man,
But subjects Man to Power.

"Yet every day in seven, at least,
One bright republic shall be known—
Man's world awhile hath surely ceast,
When God proclaims his own!

"Six days may Rank divide the poor,
O Dives, from thy banquet-hall;
The seventh the Father opens the door,
And holds his feast for all!"

PART IV
GUARDING THE INHERITANCE

CHAPTER I

DEMOCRACY AT THE CROSSROADS

A GRAVE suspicion has arisen in recent years as to whether the modern world has not been trying to run itself in accordance with political principles, for which it is not yet prepared either morally or intellectually. "Democracy is nothing more than an experiment in government," said James Russell Lowell, and the same conception underlies the great hope expressed in Lincoln's Gettysburg address that "government of the people, by the people, for the people" should not perish from the earth. Is this experiment going to succeed? The future of our political civilization depends upon the answer to that question. That democracy is at the crossways to-day many competent authorities believe.

One reason why democracy is to-day in such sore straits is because we have forgotten that it was conceived in religion, and that it stands or falls according as we are able to develop in the people the spirit of devotion to the common good of all, and the spirit of self-sacrifice among those who have special intel-

lectual and material endowments. "If anything ever profoundly surprised me," said Mazzini, speaking of democracy, "it is that so many persons have hitherto been blind to the eminently religious character of the movement." The same truth was expressed by Kant when he contended that each man is an end in himself and not a mere means to some other end, however exalted. Democracy is an assertion of the supreme spiritual dignity and moral worth of each individual member of the human race, irrespective of the accidents of birth and place, irrespective even of differences of character and ability—"a man's a man for a' that." The fundamental reform for which the times call is a reconsideration of the ends for which all civilized government exists, a recognition of the responsibility of every citizen to assist in the attainment of these ends—in a word, a return to a Christian measure of social values.

A recent writer, Mr. G. A. Studdert Kennedy, takes the view that without religion democracy is impossible of realization and bases his argument upon the new psychology. We used to be taught that men were completely rational and that other animals were completely instinctive. We are now learning that man is born with a very powerful, impulsive and

instinctive nature—that we have all the instincts of the animal, and "then some"—and that this nature has very much more to do with our behavior and our judgments than we want to admit.

Everyone knows how difficult it is to be rational in the presence of a highly emotional idea, and practically all the really important subjects of life and conduct involve the emotions. Now, our instincts and our emotional impulses are a very precious possession, being, speaking biologically, very much older and very much wiser than our intellects. But we have the gift of reason also and its function seems to be to combine and harmonize our experiences in the interests of our active life, and also to synthesize and sublimate our impulses and instincts about which our experiences inevitably tend to group themselves. Kennedy contends that such a synthesis of the impulsive nature can only be made by means of a religion at once sublime and adequate. This synthesis, he holds, is the first condition of rationality, and declares that it is for this reason rationality must have a religious basis; unless it has, he argues, our syllogisms may be logically self-consistent, but our premises will be based upon "prejudices and unsublimated impulses."

A study of the recent history of our world

will afford many illustrations of this fact. If the argument is a valid one, we are faced with the fact that, inasmuch as democracy is only possible so far as men are rational, and rationality is only possible in so far as men are religious, therefore the great necessity for democracy is a true religion.

This being so, the preservation of Sunday as a day for worship and the cultivation of the Christian spirit becomes one of the first duties of a democratic state. Nor must it be forgotten that the roots of democracy are to be found in the Bible, and especially in the book of Deuteronomy, and that the first enunciation of the democratic principle of equality of privilege is in the fourth commandment as given in that Book—"that thy manservant . . . may rest as well as thou."

CHAPTER II

THE SABBATH AND CIVIL LAW

WHAT the state has to do with Sunday is a question of importance. The answer depends upon what is conceived to be the function of the state. Views upon this question may be found between two extremes, that of Saint Augustine, who regarded the state as the result of man's sinful condition and as the direct antithesis to the kingdom of God, and that of Hegel, who saw in the state the highest ethical form of society, the realization of the moral ideal.

The Sabbath had its origin among peoples whose state was a theocracy, and has been connected historically not with theological but religious institutions. It was supported and enforced by religious sanctions. The state has, in the past, made the law of the Sabbath its special care, and has enforced that law by civil sanctions. Ought it still to do so?

In discussing the matter of Sunday laws we must keep in mind that laws cannot be made; they can only be discovered. This is as true of a law of human society as of so called natural laws. The Ten Commandments were not as arbitrary as the story of the giving of the law

at Sinai would seem to indicate, but were written in the constitution of man and learned very gradually by the race. "Law," writes Gierke, "is the result of a common conviction not that a thing *shall be* but that it *is*." This is eminently true of the law of the Sabbath, as our study has clearly shown.

"Man has a new right," said M. Hector Denis, of the Belgian Council of Labor, "the right to leisure and rest as well as work. . . . The history of labor legislation can be given in two words: The right to rest is inherent in man's physiological structure. From this follows the social need to do away with the exhaustion resulting from overwork and to conserve the working power, the most precious possession of the nation. . . . Science traces out the path for the modern lawmaker. His difficult but glorious mission is to accomplish the normal synthesis of these two inalienable rights springing from the very laws of life; the right to use one's working powers and the right to conserve them." [1]

The same conception of the duty of the state in this regard was expressed in the *London Times* in 1916 by Lord Sydenham, when his country had its back to the wall and was

[1] Quoted in *Fatigue and Efficiency*, by Josephine Goldmark, p. 39.

suffering an industrial strain perhaps unexampled in history. Pleading for the necessity of preventing cumulative fatigue by stated seasons of rest, he said, "The great principle of compulsory rest which Moses taught to mankind calls for scientific application to lives far more strenuous and more complex than those of the Israelites." This, then, is the basis of Sunday laws.

We have seen how in every age the Sabbath has been the subject of civil enactment and has been guarded by state sanctions. In Old Testament times, under a theocracy, this included both aspects of the day, the physical and the religious. To what extent the state has a right to deal with the latter aspect in our day has been the subject of much argument. Lord Hugh Cecil, in his delightful little book, *Conservatism*, holds that "Religion is the standard by which the plans of politicians must be judged, and a religious purpose must purify their aims and methods."[1] But for interference of the state in matters of purely religious concern the modern Western world has no use. "Where the state ends, man begins," said Nietzsche, and it is with man in his essential nature that religion is concerned.

[1] Reprinted by permission of Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., publishers, London.

CHAPTER III

DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY

"THE end of civil society," said Lord Acton, "is the establishment of liberty for the realization of moral duties."

The question arises, To what extent and to what ends has the state a right to interfere with the liberty of the individual? Our ideas upon this question are largely due to writings upon political subjects during the past seventy-five years.

"The French Revolution and the general movement of the human spirit to which it was a response," writes Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, former British premier, "has handed over to us the task of reconciling individual right and communal activity, individual freedom and social organization, democracy and the differentiation of political function." [1]

But it is from the Greeks, and particularly from Aristotle, that we derive the purest conception of the state and its function, a conception from which we have not been able to depart through all the intervening centuries,

[1] *The Socialist Movement*, p. 22. Reprinted by permission of Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., London.

namely, that "man by the law of his being is a member of a political community," that the true state is a "partnership in a life of virtue," and that law is the expression of pure and passionless reason: that righteousness consists for each man in the fulfillment of his appointed function in the life and action of the community; and finally that the function of the state is to promote these ends. Herbert Spencer looked forward to the time when "law will have no other justification than that gained by its maintenance of the conditions of complete life in the associated state," which is simply Aristotle's view, namely, that complete life in the associated state is the end of government. According to the great thinkers of antiquity, the true state exists not for wealth or for power, but for a full and noble life; administration is to provide opportunity for the highest social activity of man.

After Aristotle, Rousseau was the most vital thinker upon this question. He emphasized chiefly the dependence of the individual on society for his thought and feelings as well as for his material needs. To him the state was just the whole or organized society, and he re-established the old Greek ideal of political society as the opportunity for the realization of what is best in man. From these principles

we have departed from time to time, only to return to them as the firm basis of social and political life.

Of recent years, as pointed out by Professor Ernest Barker in *Political Life from Spencer to To-day*, we have swung between the opposite points of the doctrine of *laissez faire*, the restriction of state activity to the bare minimum in government of the individual, of which Spencer and Mill were the chief advocates, and more guiding governance on the part of the state, the rule of the wise and able man, and even military regulation and regimentation of the life and conduct of the community; for which Carlyle and Ruskin were the forceful and eloquent advocates.

Green argued that the state must intervene to remove all obstacles which impede the free moral development of its citizens, and to this ideal the Socialists would add that society should take into its hands the control of all economic life—though we do not hear so much of this since the recent experiments in Russia. Hegel brought in the idea of the divinity of the Nation which he got from the old Greek city-state that "none of its citizens belongs to himself, since they all belong to the state." Treitschke and the Prussians carried this idea to its logical conclusion, making the state all and the

individual nothing, and the same idea inspires modern nationalism, which is one of the worst inheritances from the World War, the essence of which is that the members of each nation believe their national civilization to be civilization. The Great War showed what that means.

Green and Bosanquet showed that it is possible to free the Hegelian theory from its excrescences and absurdities and show at its heart a great and splendid truth, namely, that "it is in the life of the state, and only there, that human life in all its ramifications can obtain the nourishment it needs for its appropriate expansion and development." Compare Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God.

Mill's Conception of Liberty

John Stuart Mill was the great advocate of individualism. His ideas still have a profound influence and are urged from time to time by opponents of Sunday laws. Mill stressed the importance of developing the individual so that his active and intellectual natures might have their utmost scope and reach their highest efficiency. Thus he followed in the train of the Greeks. But he feared that the state might interfere with the free and spontaneous development of the individual, and even went so far as to oppose state education

as tending to kill originality. "A general state education," he wrote, "is a mere contrivance for molding people to be exactly like one another"—a statement which contains very much more than a grain of truth, one is forced to say.

Mill's position is seen in his attitude to what he terms Sabbatarian legislation, which he designates as "an important example of illegitimate interference with the rightful liberty of the individual, not simply threatened but long since carried into triumphant effect." But it was because the things forbidden on Sunday were considered *religiously* wrong, that Mill made his protest. "Without doubt," he writes, "the abstinence of one day of the week, so far as the exigencies of life permit, from the usual daily occupation, though in no way religiously binding on any except Jews, is a highly beneficial custom." And inasmuch as this custom cannot be observed without general consent, Mill concedes that "it may be allowable and right that the law should guarantee to each the observance by others of the custom of suspending the greater operations of industry on a particular day." This justification, however, he does not think should apply to "the self-chosen occupations in which a person may think to employ his leisure; nor does it hold

good in the smallest degree for the legal restrictions on amusements." He recognizes that Sunday amusements for some may mean Sunday work for others, but he thinks it may be worth the labor of the few if the many can enjoy recreation thus provided, "*provided* the occupation is freely chosen and may be freely resigned."

In discussing this matter, we must ask the question, Is state coercion necessarily an encroachment upon the liberty of the subject, or are the elements of value secured by collective control of such a character that individual eccentricity must yield in the interests of the common welfare? We have people who have conscientious scruples against military service in war time, against vaccination during the epidemic, against the education of their children (Dhoukobors). In all such cases the state must have right of way if the welfare of the community or the nation is not to be imperiled.

If a man by working on Sunday affected himself alone, possibly the law would have no right to interfere with him; but in modern industry this is impossible. Spiritually a man is as much a part of society as physically he is part of the world's fauna. Besides, a shop or a factory which was open on Sunday would

have an unfair advantage over its competitors, and a small minority would thus always have it in their power to enforce Sunday labor on a large majority. It is on this ground that the law is justified in imposing its restrictions on all; and when this general prohibition is found to be on the whole a great advantage, legislators naturally have hesitated to admit exceptions which, though plausible or justifiable in themselves, might tend to weaken its force. It was on the basis of such principles as these that the Parliament of Canada enacted the Lord's Day Act, a statute which avoids any dictation in the matter of the religious or recreational use of Sunday, but aims at giving to as many people as possible the privilege of a day of rest.

CHAPTER IV

MAKING PEOPLE GOOD BY LAW

One of the commonest objections to Sunday laws is that the objector does not believe in making people good by law or sending them to heaven by act of Parliament, a belief in which most rational persons will readily participate because of the impossibility of the former proposition and the doubtful ethics of the latter—if it were possible. Certainly, the state has no such functions to perform, its work, so far as the morals of its people are concerned, being purely negative. No one has put this better than Green when he says that the state has no positive moral function of making its members better; it has the negative moral function of removing the obstacles which prevent them from making themselves better, that is, in removing the obstacles which lie before human capacity as it seeks to do things worth doing. Hobhouse writes to the same end when he says that "it is not possible to compel morality, because morality is the act and character of a free agent; but that it is possible to create conditions under which morality can

develop, and among these not the least is freedom from compulsion by others." [1]

Robert Louis Stevenson used to say that he never thought it to be his duty to try to make other people good, but, rather, to be good himself. His duty toward other people, he thought, was to make them happy. This would seem to be the true function of the state in enacting a Sunday law, and thus we go back to the ancient democratic basis, that "thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou."

Then what about the question of freedom of which we hear so much and enjoy so little in these days? Kant used to say, "Every one must seek his own happiness in the way which seems good to himself, providing that he infringes not such freedom in others to strive after a similar end, as is consistent with the freedom of all according to a general law." So Herbert Spencer: "Every one is free to do what he will, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man. Freedom of each is limited only by like liberties of all." And again Locke even more fundamentally: "Freedom of men under government is to have a standard rule to live by, common to every one of that society

[1] *Liberalism*, p. 143. Reprinted by permission of Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., London.

and made by the legislative power erected in it." This is the basis of freedom in a democracy. Freedom can be obtained only by obedience to law. When all submit to the law imposed by the Common Will, then obedience to the law is not slavery but true liberty.

Many who complain of the restrictions of modern Sunday laws seem to forget that it is these very laws which give them the freedom of the day. Others who oppose the laws do not hesitate to make use of the security and liberty of speech which the state affords as a vantage ground from which to denounce its work. They rely upon the general laws which protect them in freedom of speech and the publication of their views and attacks upon the law, but would emancipate themselves from this particular law which they find oppressive to their consciences. They forget that upon this basis the whole fabric and machinery of society would quickly go to pieces. One is reminded of the picture of the "democratic man" in Plato's *Republic* drunk with the strong wine of freedom, where every appetite, every passion, every notion is a citizen well qualified to lead as any other. The fault Plato found with the man of this character was that he had no principles, but pretexts for acting in an obviously convenient way, no clear ideas of right and

wrong, or truth and error; and he associated no permanent value with the distinction between them.

Law and Manners

While it has been necessary to deal with the legal aspect of the question, and the principles which underlie Sunday legislation, the very great majority of the people are not moved by such considerations in their observance of the Lord's Day. Their observance is a custom to which they have conformed from childhood and which they see no reason for changing now. It is with them not a matter of law, but of manners. The distinguished English jurist and parliamentarian, the late Lord Moulton, in an address delivered to the Authors' Club in London some time before his death, discusses in a striking manner this subject.

There are, he said, "three great domains of human action. First comes Positive Law, where our actions are prescribed by laws binding on us which must be obeyed. Next comes the domain of Free Choice, which includes all those actions as to which we claim and enjoy complete freedom. But between these two there is a third large and important domain—there rules neither Positive Law nor Absolute Freedom. In that domain there is

no law which inexorably determines our course of action, and yet we feel that we are not free to choose as we would." This domain Lord Moulton calls "the domain of Obedience to the Unenforceable. The obedience is the obedience of a man to that which he cannot be forced to obey. He is the enforcer of the law upon himself." This great country between Law and Free Choice he thinks of as the domain of Manners. "I do not wish to call it Duty," he says, "for that is too narrow to describe it, nor would I call it Morals for the same reason. It might include both, but it extends beyond them. It covers all cases of right doing where there is no one to make you do it but yourself."

Lord Moulton goes on to say that the greatness of a nation, its true civilization, is to be measured by the extent of this land of Obedience of the Unenforceable. It measures the extent to which a nation trusts its citizens, and its existence and area testify to the way they behave in response to that trust. "Mere obedience to law does not measure the greatness of a nation. It can easily be obtained by a strong executive, and most easily of all from a timorous people. . . . The true test is the extent to which the individuals composing the nation can be trusted to obey self-imposed law."

Lord Moulton calls attention to two dangers menacing our world to-day due to the tendency, especially in the younger nations, to make laws to regulate everything; and also to another tendency which is marked to-day, to treat questions which are not regulated by positive law as being matters of absolute choice. The reader will not need that I should give instances of the former tendency which is particularly manifest in Russia and Italy and on this American continent. The latter tendency is illustrated by the movement to secularize the Lord's Day and thus turn it into a holiday. In dealing with the observance of Sunday, positive law should concern itself with the matter of business or labor simply. It should not deal with the matter of the use of the day either for worship or for amusement; this belongs, and rightly so, to the domain not of law but of manners.

CHAPTER V

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH SUNDAY?

THE careless indifference with which entire classes of society, in their devotion to pleasure, are willing to jeopardize the whole great institution of the Lord's Day is simply an illustration of the selfish invasion of the Domain of Manners by that of Free Choice. One need be no ascetic to see that the conversion of our Sunday into simple pleasure-seeking, however innocent in itself, involves an immeasurable loss to all the deeper forces that go to making any civilization deserving the name. Intelligent people may be asked to think enough not to sacrifice one of the greatest spiritual achievements of the race for a couple of days of automobile riding and golf. Are we going to lose all sense of proportionate values?

Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, while premier of Great Britain, addressing the Free Church Council at Brighton, England, expressed regret that there was so much overindulgence in recreation to-day that no one was permitted to spend a quiet Sunday. "I am amazed," he said, "at many of my friends saying that the old Scottish Sunday was a burden. I would like to see a

state of society where every man and woman preferred the old Scottish Sabbath to the modern French one; because in such a state of society you would have fine, solid, eternal foundations of character and of self-control."

The old Scottish Sabbath with its somewhat dour aspect is gone; and the devil never feared holy water more than some people do its possible return. It is probable that their fears are quite groundless, but we may well ask the question whether it will be possible for us to develop those "fine, solid, eternal foundations of character and of self-control" without it; or at least without its central conception of Sunday as a day of religious worship. For, after all, the question before us is not, Shall we try to bring back the Sunday of our fathers? The world in which our fathers lived is not our world. The question is, What shall Sunday stand for in our community and national life? Shall it stand for Religion, or shall it stand for Amusement? What shall we seek on Sunday, recreation or re-creation? Or shall it afford opportunity for both?

This is the question that confronts us, and it may be that the very bases of our civilization rest upon the answer we give to the same. Beaconsfield pronounced the Sabbath to be the keystone of civilization. He did not mean

the Sabbath as a civil institution, affording a day of rest from toil simply; rather the Sabbath as a day of religion and the cultivation of the ideal. The problem is thus not one for the state, but rather for the church and the home.

A short time ago I had occasion to spend a Sunday in one of the larger towns of the province of Quebec, Canada. In the morning the people thronged to mass, and all day long individuals sought the sanctuary for their private devotions. In the afternoon, I heard the strains of an orchestra. Walking in the direction of the music, I came to an inclosed place where a considerable number of people had gathered. Some were playing croquet. Others were engaged in similar pastimes. A group of men, women, and children were gathered about the musicians with evident delight.

I was reminded of the difference of observance of the Lord's Day in Roman Catholic and Protestant communities, respectively, and I asked myself whether I was not witnessing a healthier scheme of Sunday observance in this Roman Catholic town than that which prevailed in many Protestant communities. We speak of the Scotch observance of the Sabbath with admiration, but the Irish are as scrupu-

lous in this particular as the Scotch—though in a different way. In Ireland everybody goes to church once on Sunday. In Scotland, everybody goes twice, but in England and America, the majority of the people do not go at all. The Irishman in Ireland and the Frenchman in Canada may go to a hurling match or a ball game on Sunday afternoon, but his conscience would prick him if in the morning he had not attended the chapel or church.

There are some to-day who urge frankly that the morning and evening of Sunday should be reserved for worship, the afternoon for quiet recreation. "Even the clergy," writes a competent observer, "have begun to see, in large numbers, that the alternative ways of spending Sunday are no longer churchgoing minus recreation and recreation minus churchgoing, but churchgoing plus recreation, and recreation minus churchgoing." It is doubtful whether it is possible now to save the Lord's Day as a whole, and it is imperative that we save as much of it as we can.

I do not wish to be understood as commending the Roman Catholic method of observance. I would treat the problem positively rather than negatively. Recreation has its place in Sunday, but we cannot fail to heed

what Sir Walter Scott said: "Give the world one half of Sunday, and you will find that religion has no strong hold on the other." The time has come when the Christian Church as a whole must formulate something like a program instead of leaving Sunday progress to individual experiment. Some such statement of principles, if issued by authority, would relieve many troubled consciences and prevent much revolt. Certainly, the method of scolding people because they do on Sunday what the church thinks they ought not to do is not pedagogically wise, nor has it proved effective. Dr. L. P. Jacks, in his book, *Constructive Citizenship*, reprobates the modern method of trying to bring about a better world by putting a stop to evils. He thinks the wiser way is to give impulse to good. He makes use of an illustration which he credits to Herbert Spencer:

"In the process of rolling metal sheets, it sometimes happens that a bulge appears on the surface of the sheet. How is it to be got rid of? By hammering the bulge? In that way you are apt to crack the sheet. The way is to hammer around it, beginning far off and coming closer and closer to the bulge. Soon the bulge slowly diminishes and finally disappears."

CHAPTER VI

SUNDAY RECREATION

WHAT sort of recreations, then, shall we have on Sunday? Or, to go back to the primary question, should Sunday be a day of recreation? Certainly! The very idea of the Sabbath involved that. In the Old Testament the Sabbath and joy were closely associated in the thoughts of the people, and the same was true of the Lord's Day in earliest times. The etymological meaning of the word "recreation" is seen if we place a hyphen after the second letter: *re-creation.* Is not that the very function of the Sabbath? So written, it offers a new test of the manifold and sometimes misdirected activities for which we make the Lord's Day sponsor, and having a court of its own it takes directly its own proper station as a minister of life. The quest for recreation is a healthful one, for it is really a quest for life.

As for the children in our homes, to say they are not to play on Sunday is to say that for that day they are not to be children, for with them play is the natural expression of life. But the recreations of both

children and grown-ups should be different on Sunday from those of the other days of the week. How different, each will have to decide for himself. They should be such as minister not simply to the needs of the body, but, rather, to the mind and spirit, and which send us back to our work and studies on Monday not only with clearer intellect and livelier spirits, but also with a clearer sense of the presence about us of an invisible world. "They tune their hearts by far the noblest aim," said Burns of his people on the Sabbath. With such a standard both in worship and in recreation we would preserve those values which in the traditions and customs of the past the day has stood for and afforded opportunity to cultivate. It is possible that in doing this we shall be accused of "Puritanism." What of that? For all its narrowness, there was something in Puritanism we can ill afford to forget—the assertion of the supreme value of the soul. No nation can afford to overlook the needs of the soul, and our approval or disapproval of Sunday amusements will be conditioned by our sense of this value and the place the Lord's Day occupies as a conservator of the same. The question is not that of the right or wrong of a game of golf or tennis or ball on Sunday. It is, rather, the larger

question, What will be the effect upon the spiritual growth and development of the nation if we devote the day of the spirit to purely physical recreations?

Let me quote the words of Robertson, of Brighton, in 1849, when the matter of Sunday amusements was being debated in England: "To recklessly loosen the hold of the nation on the sanctity of the Lord's Day would be most mischievous; to do so willfully would be an act almost diabolical. For if we must choose between Puritan overprecision on the one hand, and on the other that laxity which, in many parts of the Continent, has marked the day from other days only by more riotous worldliness and a more entire abandonment of the whole community to amusements, no Christian would hesitate—no English Christian at least, to whom the day is hallowed by all that is endearing in early associations, and who feels how much it is the very bulwark of his country's purity." [1]

The Report of the Commission on Leisure of the *Conference on Politics, Economics and Christianity* sums up the matter admirably when it says: "The ideal Sunday would seem to be the taking of spiritual recreation in

[1] *Sermons*, p. 79.

worship and some bodily or mental recreation as well; not as something alien to the other, but as a legitimate part of it."

To secularize Sunday is to secularize life, and that means inevitable decay. To a greater and greater extent this the English-speaking world is doing. Take, for instance, the Sunday ball games. These games are played usually on Sunday afternoon. They are attended not only by adults but also by boys and girls in those formative years of life when character is being fixed and ideals are being formed which make or mar the same. Moreover, the boys are passing through a period in physical development when the muscles are growing at a rapid rate, and with this development there are associated profound changes in character. There is nothing so interesting to a boy at this period as feats of physical strength and skill. Think what it must mean to the youth of our land when the most interesting thing which occurs on Sunday is a "ball game"! Pindar's dictum, quoted above, that no one is great who is not great in his hands and his feet, was crystallized in the education of Greek youths, and models of physical symmetry and beauty were set for future ages to admire and copy. But the Greek education lacked the religious element, and Greece perished.

This is the warning which comes to us to-day with the tremendous vogue of sports and games. We must nurture in the souls of our youth such ideals as Tennyson's Sir Galahad, whose strength was as the strength of ten because his heart was pure, and the exhortation of Paul to be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Our chief hope of imparting these ideals is through the preservation of that day which in the thought and tradition and custom of Anglo-Saxon Christianity stood for the cultivation of spiritual rather than of physical strength and beauty. If we let Sunday go, if we give it over to sport and games, we may indeed breed a race of lopsided physical giants, but not of men and women built four-square, growing daily into the divine image and becoming worthy to stand before the Son of man.

Sunday Play in the Home

Dr. Henry F. Cope discusses this question with his usual good sense, unbiassed by mere traditionalism. "A child is a growing person," he writes, "learning life by play." But that does not mean that the barriers which we have erected about the day in the past are to be thrown down by a more liberal age. Rather, he says, "make the day different by throwing

down the barriers that stand on other days. Let this be the day when the barriers between fathers and sons, parents and children, are let down and all can enter into the joy of living." Whether or not we can find it possible in this overbusy age to obey the injunction of Froebel, "Come let us live with our children!" on the other days of the week, we have no excuse on Sunday. Cope outlines a policy on Sunday play under these heads:

Keep the day as one of family unity.

Maintain that unity by doing ideal things together.

Maintain the family unity by stepping into the child's ideal life.

Expect activity and use it.

Seek the beautiful.

He then gives four points in which Sunday play may be different from that of other days. First, Sunday should be the day of the *best* plays. Second, Sunday play should never interfere with the rights of others who wish to spend the day in quiet or observe the day differently from us. Third, Sunday play must neither cause nor add additional or unnecessary labor; and, fourth, it must not interfere with the pleasures of others.[1]

[1] *Religious Education of the Family*, p. 150ff. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

The reader is referred to Dr. Cope's book for a development of these points and a bibliography for further study of the question, also to an essay by the present writer, *Sunday in the Home* (Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1928).

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

We should now be prepared, after this long study of the question, to come to some conclusion as to the place and function of Sunday in modern life.

Briefly, what has our study taught us? We have learned that we cannot base the observance of the Lord's Day on the fourth commandment, as a specific command of God. That statute had reference to a particular day of the week. It also celebrated a particular event in the history of the Hebrews. "The Sabbath," said Pascal, "was only a sign and in memory of the escape from Egypt; therefore it is no longer necessary, for Egypt must be forgotten" (*Pensées*). We have also learned that the reasons for the observance of the Sabbath given in the Old Testament differ from age to age, and that these reasons are based upon dissimilar conceptions of the meaning and purpose of the Sabbath.

In our study of the Lord's Day, we saw how very gradually the observance of the day developed, and how late was the theory which connected it with the Sabbath. The authority

of the Lord's Day is to be found in no specific command of Scripture, but is based as Jesus based the authority of the Sabbath upon the timeless needs of man. The Sabbath was made for man, and so was the Lord's Day. Man is therefore lord both of the Sabbath and of Sunday. It is upon this basis that the fourth commandment is still binding upon Christian people. The time of observance has changed. The human needs it ministers to are changeless.

The question of the authority of the Sabbath idea is to be answered by asking, "Is it an end of life or is it a rule of conduct?" The basis of a true ethic is that its rules are ends of life. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, said Jesus. This is an end of life. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, to the Pharisees of Jesus' day was simply a rule of conduct dissociated from any end of life. The ethic of Jesus had concern to ends of life only, so he said the Sabbath was made for man. Only such an ethic is eternally binding.

The observance of Sunday is the concern of both the state and of the church. The church if it is to be true to its Master cannot overlook the needs of the body, nor can the state fulfill its true function if it fails to make provision for the needs of the souls of its

citizens. But the work of the state is negative while that of the church is positive. All that the state can do is to afford such quiet and leisure on Sunday as is necessary for worship. The church seeks to minister to the souls of men at leisure, when psychologically they are most open to the religious appeal. The state may make use of compulsion in enforcing the use of the day for rest, but neither the church nor the state may resort to force in its religious observance. In the past all efforts to bring about the religious observance of the day by legal and ecclesiastical penalties have been in vain. To substitute inner sanctions and inhibitions for outer authority based on force either divine or human is perhaps the greatest need of our day. Religion is by nature the tenderest, freest, and innermost function of life. It perishes as soon as constraint, the fear of man, or politics come into play. That is the most evident of all the truths which ecclesiastical history teaches—a truth the church has been very slow to learn.

The church has a duty to perform in guiding the minds and conduct of its people in the proper observance of Sunday. The time has come for the church to work out some definite program of Sunday observance in this modern world, so that the minds of the people may be

clear upon the question. In making the following suggestions for such a program, I shall follow, as I have throughout the latter part of this study, the great word of Jesus. If the Sabbath was made for man—and Sunday also—then it was made for his threefold nature —body, mind, spirit.

Body. Sunday should be a day of recreation. The thought of freedom and joy is associated with the Sabbath idea from earliest times, and any attempts to make it a day of gloom, however well intentioned, have not been a success. Hence recreation must have its place in Sunday observance, especially for children whose natural expression is in play. It need not be said that Sunday recreation should be in harmony with the character of the day as one of rest and spiritual uplift, so that one may go back to his work on Monday not only with renewed corporeal vigor, but also with a deeper sense of the presence of God in the world and in his own life.

Mind. Sunday should be a day of thought and meditation. No man can "live on twenty-four hours a day"—really live, not simply exist—who does not give some attention to the serious side of life and the cultivation of his mind. Sunday affords additional leisure for this occupation, and the man who does not

devote a part of the day to reading and thinking about matters outside his daily life and occupation, becomes a mere slave to routine, and the ability to think quickly declines.

Spirit. Sunday is a day of worship. No man is spending Sunday well, or doing his duty to himself, his family or his community, who does not go to church on Sunday. "I go to church on Sunday," said Mr. Gladstone, "because I love religion, and I go to church on Sunday because I love England." I need not add that Sunday is pre-eminently a day for the *Home*, and family life, a day when we have leisure to follow the beautiful injunction of Froebel: "Come, let us live with our children."

And this leads me to say one closing word to parents and those who have the care of children in the home. Mr. E. S. Martin, in one of his charming essays in the Easy Chair of *Harper's Magazine*, last year discussed the prospects of our grandchildren. After speaking of many conditions of our present age which will have their effect upon our children and grandchildren, he says: "But more than anything else the prospects of our grandchildren depend upon religion, upon the kind of religion the world gets in the next generation, and on the amount of illumination it can bring about the errand of human life, and the temper it

can diffuse among those who run it."[1] That is a very important statement, the truth of which all will recognize. And the religion of our grandchildren depends very much upon the Sunday habits we are teaching to our children to-day.

Two Suggestions

I want, therefore, to make two suggestions as to how parents may help in this regard, namely, by getting the boys and girls to commit to memory on Sunday choice passages of Scripture and of poetry which has spiritual and moral significance and teaching; and by establishing the habit of going to church Sunday morning. It has been said that religion is poetry, and, as a matter of fact, most religious expression in literature is in poetic form. It may be added that religion is poetry *believed.* Can we put into the child's mind through poetry a religion it will believe? I think we can, and that the effort should be made in all Christian homes. Dr. Charles W. Eliot, in a leaflet entitled *The Education of our Boys and Girls,* deals with this subject among others. He instances such a poem as Longfellow's "*The Village Blacksmith,*" a very simple poem of universal elements, which any child can

[1] Reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York.

learn by heart, and which contains some of the most fundamental conceptions of religion. Take the verse,

> "He hears his daughter's voice,
> Singing in the village choir,
> And it makes his heart rejoice,
> . . . . . .
> It sounds to him like her mother's voice,
> Singing in Paradise!"

Or take Leigh Hunt's "Abou Ben Adhem," which teaches us that we can best show our love to God by loving our fellows, or Bryant's "Waterfowl," in which God is presented to the child mind as guiding the bird through the pathless air, and just as he guides the bird he will guide me. Or such a poem as Sears'

> "It came upon a midnight clear,
> That glorious song of old."

I need not continue this theme, nor need I point out specific passages of Scripture which should be committed to memory by all children. A part of every Sunday in every home should be devoted to this exercise.

Then next establish early in life the habit of going to church. The influence of church going does not depend upon what the child understands in the service or the sermon. If it did the chief priests and the scribes might

well shut him out of the temple. It is rather the silent influences which tell upon him. No child can enter a church for the first time without feeling a sense of mystery which is akin to awe. The large spaces, peculiar furnishings, the silence, the dim religious light, often suggestive of twilight and forest—the two most helpful of all environments of worship—the isolation from everything which is familiar to him, the altar and the desk, the sacred symbols and mottoes, fill him with a sense of strangeness and difference which makes him quiet and watchful. Then the people come in. They are very quiet. They are serious. They are there for some unusual purpose. He cannot but feel the contagion of their bearing. The service begins. The fluted organ, the pealing tones of music, the vestured choir, the voice of the minister, the singing of choir and congregation, the bowed head and the bent knee, all carry the impress of strangeness and the inexplainable. Doubtless children often get over these first feelings; but if there is any influence, certainly any religious influence, that has power over them, it is the quiet atmosphere of reverence and worship, which surrounds them at church. It is doubtful whether any future religious impressions can make a mark as deep and lasting. There is no habit in life, I am

convinced of this, that is of more importance than this early habit of going to church. When we ask men to-day why they do not go to church, they will usually say that they were forced to do so when children, and they got to hate it, or else that they were not compelled to go and never came to love it. The first reason is merely an excuse and a poor one. As a matter of fact, they never were put to any hardships in the matter. They were sent to school and taught to read, but they do not now urge that as an excuse for not opening a book. The second is a valid reason, and was the fault of their parents.

In these closing words of my study, I stress the importance of teaching children the habit of going to church. No religious influence is so important. Splendid work is done in the Sunday school, but if I had to choose between Sunday school and the church service for young children, I would without hesitation choose the latter. Religion is not a didactic thing; it is not a matter of learning lessons; it is the life of God in the soul of man. All religion begins with a sense of awe, of a shadowy, superhuman, commanding Presence: "God was in this place and I knew it not." It is in the church service that the child gets this sense of an unseen presence, higher and greater than anything

human. "The church represents the gathered religious instinct of the ages; and that which primitive man got vaguely from the vast spaces and the terrible powers of nature, now purified and refined by ages of thought and prayer, the child breathes in the atmosphere of an earnest Christian church."

"Heaven lies about us in our infancy!
Shades of the prison-house begin to close
Upon the growing Boy.
But he beholds the light, and whence it flows,
He sees it in his joy;
The Youth who daily farther from the east,
Must travel, still is Nature's priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended."

It is the supreme function of parents and the teachers of youth to see that this light does not

" . . . die away
And fade into the light of common day."

3-27-42

INDEX

Abrahams, I, 67
Actors' Equity Association, 147
Allen, A. V. G., 100
Amusement, Sunday, 135f., 151, 182f., 185, 231ff., 234f., 237
Amusement, Sunday, J. S. Mill on, 222
Ancient Story, An, 58f.
Apocalypse, 101, 161, 206f.
Apocalyptic, 72
Archery on Sunday, 124
Athanasius, 106
Authority, principle of, 154

Babylonian and Hebrew sabbaths contrasted, 40, 46
Babylonian *sabattum*, 36, 40, 41
Bennett, Arnold, 191
Benzinger, I, 30
Between the Testaments, 72f.
Bible study and culture, 192ff.
Birthday of the Church, 161
"Blue laws," 130
Book of the Covenant, 30
Book of Sports, 125f., 128
Bosanquet, 221
Browning, Robert, 166
Buddhist sabbath, 29

Calvin and the Sabbath, 119
Canadian Sunday laws, 147f.
Cecil, Lord H., 150
Change of day, 94ff.
Change of emphasis, 149
Charlemagne's decree, 115
Charles, R. H., 93f.
Cheyne, T. K., 58f.
Children's reading, 190
Christianity and Judaism, 93
Christmas and Easter customs, 45
Chrysostom, 106
Church and state, 150f., 244f.
Church going, habit of, 249f.
Climatic influences, 177
Codex Bezae, 85
Consciousness of God, 205f.
Constantine's edict, 104, 108f,
Continental Sunday, 123ff., 132
Cope, H. F., 240f.
Conference on Politics, Economics and Christianity, 238
Council of Laodicea, 114
Council of Macon, 114
Council of Orleans, 114
Cranmer's catechism, 119
Crystal Palace controversy, 135

Day of rest and gladness, 64f., 105
Decalogues, more than one, 33f.
Decretals of Gregory, 114f.
Democracy and religion, 211f.
Denis, H., 216
Dickie, G. A., 182
Didache, 102, 104
Dies solis, 100
Divine authority, the, 62f.
Durant, Will, 170f.

Early English laws, 117f.
Early Sunday laws, 116
Ebionites and Sabbath, 101
Education in Sunday School, 192ff.
Emerson, R. W., 152f.
England, Early Sunday observance, 124
Epistle of Barnabas, 102

Equality of privilege, 214
Erubin, 73
European legislation, 142

Fatigue, defined, 168ff.; a sort of poisoning, 173; effects of, 172f., 178f.; and self-control, 174; and tiredness, 174; and degeneracy, 176f.
Feasts among primitive peoples, 29f.
Feasts, early Hebrew, 30f.
France, Anatole, 110
France, movement for better Sunday, 140f.
French experiment, the, 140
Futility, cult of, 179f.

Glazebrook, M. G., 108, 119, 130
Goldmark, Josephine, 143, 173
Gorky, M., 185f.
Great Divide, the, 48, 53f.
Great War, the, 142f.

Habit of churchgoing, 249f.
Hall, G. S., 10
Hawaiian sabbaths, 27
Health of the Munition Worker, 143
Hebrew and Babylonian sabbaths, 40f., 46
Heylin, Peter, 118, 123
Historical standpoint, 21ff.
History of the Sabbath, 118
Hobson, Charles, 141
Holiness, postexilic, 56f.
How laws get made, 110
Human machine, the, 167ff.
Humboldt, Baron von, 133

Ideals for youth, 240

Jastrow, Morris, 37 note, 40
Jesus and the Sabbath, 78f, 83, 88, 95f., 160f., 164, 167, 244
Jewish Sabbath hymn, 65f.
Josephus, 98
Judaism and Christianity, 92f.

Kennedy, G. A. S., 211f.
Kent, C. F., 63
Kuriake, 101

Law and freedom, 226ff.
Law and manners, 228ff.
Lecky, W. E. H., 153
Leisure, problem of, 151, 184f.
Longfellow, 11, 248
Lord's Day Act of Canada, 147f., 244
Lord's Day and resurrection, 90
Lord's Day and Sabbath, 88ff., 91, 93f., 243
Lord's Day, origin of name, 101
Lucky and unlucky days, 36f.
Luther, Martin, and the Sabbath, 120f.
Luther's catechism, 121

Macaulay, Lord, 136
Macdonald, J. R., 218, 231
Maitland Terrace, 91f.
"Mark of the Beast," 109
Material and spiritual, 195f.
Memorial character of Lord's Day and Sabbath, 89f.
Memorizing Scripture, 248f.
Merrie England, 117f.
Middle Ages, 112f.
Mill, J. S., 221ff.
Mishna, 73
Monotonous work, effect of, 173, 181
Moore, G. F., 39
Morals in the making, 75
Mosso, 173
Moulton, Lord, 228f.

Names of Sunday, 102
Narcotics, 181f.
Nationalism, 221
New moon and Sabbath, 24f., 42ff.
Nietzsche, 182

Old wine and new, 96f.
Origen, 106

Pascal, 243
Paul and the Sabbath, 10, 85f., 99f., 161f.
Periods of history of Israel, 63f.
Philo, 98
Plato, 227
Play, Sunday (see Amusements)
Play, Sunday, in the home, 240f.
Pliny's letter to Trajan, 104
Political ideas from the Greeks to our time, 218f.
Postexilic religion, 55ff.
Power and pleasure, 206
Prayer, 204
Priestly and Prophetic ideas, 21f.
Program for Sunday, 246f.
Protestant and R. C. Sunday observance, 233f.
Puritanism, decline of, 179
Puritanism, value of, 237
Puritan Sabbath, 126f.

Quebec, Sunday in Province of, 233

"Rationalizing," danger of, 163
Recreation and re-creation, 232
Reformers and the Sabbath, 118ff., 162
Religion, postexilic, 55ff.
Restlessness of moderns, 182f.
Resurrection and Lord's Day, 90
Rhythms in nature, 170f.
Robertson, F. W., 19, 137, 200, 238
Robinson, J. H., 164
Roman attitude to Sabbath, 87

Sabbath, defined, 11; earliest and latest references, 23f.; reasons for observance in O. T., 32, 34; Meaning of word in O. T., 35; Hebrew and Babylonian, 40; postexilic, 51, 58f., 71; a delight, 60f.; and national greatness, 61; of the Scribes, 73f.; "day's journey," 75; references to in Old Testament, 48ff.; references to in New Testament, 78ff.; Roman attitude to, 87; and Lord's Day compared, 13, 88ff., 91, 93, 243; observance in Roman Empire, 98f.; references to in classics, 98f.; use of term in law improper, 117f.; and the Reformers, 118f., 162; and the Puritans, 126f.; development of idea, 159ff.; and inner life, 199ff.; Scottish, 232
Sabattum, 36
Sacred and secular, 164
Sanctions, 145ff.
Scotland, Sunday in, 129f.
Scribal ingenuity, 76f.
Sebaste, 101
Seneca, 108
Shabbath, 73
Shorter Catechism, 127
Spencer, Herbert, 219, 226, 235
Standards, 152, 154

State and church, 244f.
Steffens, L., 113
Song of Creation, 15f., 73
Sophocles, 159
Soviet power, 149
Sunday, defined, 102; early laws, 116; and Lord's Day in law, 117; called Lord's Day, 109; and Sabbath, 10f., 102; golf, 125; play (see under Amusements); in Scotland, 129; Observance Act, 128f.; travel, 136; legislation, 141f.; and civil law, 215ff.; in the home, 236, 240f.; program, 246f.
"Sundays in arrears," 179
Sunday-school education, 192ff.
Sydenham, Lord, 216f.
Synod of Dort, 120

Tabu, defined, 26
Tabu, influence of, 163
Talmud, 72
Taylor, F. W., 169f.
Tennyson, Lord, 165
Tertullian, 105
Thinking, art of, 187f.
Thinking, decline of, 188
Thomson, Sir A., 165
Tiredness and fatigue, 174
Trotter, William, 163
True Doctrine of the Sabbath, 125
Two Songs, the, 15
Tyndale and the Sabbath, 121

United States Sunday laws, 145f.
Uposatha, 29
Ur and Haran, 42

Valery, Paul, 202f.
"Venerable day of the sun," 109

Weakness and wickedness, 174
Webster, Hutton, 26ff.
Week in Roman Empire, 98
Westermarck, Edward, 28, 43, 127f.
Westminster Confession, 126f.
Whittier, 199, 201
Winslow, C.-E. A., 178
Wordsworth, 252
Worship, 201f.; influence of on children, 249f.

ulletin 188-225-

BV
110
H84

Huestis, Charles Herbert.

Sunday in the making; a historical and critical study
the Sabbath principle in inheritance and development,
Charles Herbert Huestis. New York, Cincinnati [etc.,]
Abingdon press [c1929]

256 p. 19½cm.

1. Sunday. 2. Sabbath. I. Title.

Library of Congress BV110.H68 CCSC/ef 29-1650

335225